

arV
11531

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



THIS BOOK IS ONE OF A
COLLECTION MADE BY
BENNO LOEWY
1854-1919
AND BEQUEATHED TO
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Cornell University Library

arV11531

The Social science of the constitution o



3 1924 031 322 260

olin,anx



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

THE
SOCIAL SCIENCE
OF THE
CONSTITUTION OF SOCIETY
OR THE
CAUSE AND CURE
OF ITS
PRESENT EVILS.

‘And ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free.’—Jesus. John, chap. viii. v. 32.

Living in truth individually and socially involves the annihilation of War, Despotism, and Slavery in nations, and Violence, Dishonesty, and Deceit in individuals. It involves more—since it requires us to act as brethren of one family.

LONDON:
EFFINGHAM WILSON;
ABEL HEYWOOD, MANCHESTER; H. ROBINSON, EDINBURGH; AND
WILLIAM LOVE, 40 ST. ENOCH SQUARE, GLASGOW.

MDCCLXII.

DEDICATION.

To the people of Great Britain generally, and to those of both sexes in all countries who would willingly resign ambitious notions of personal wealth—being satisfied and pleased were a moderate enjoyment of life's necessities assured in return for a reasonable amount of labour—to them especially we would confide the judgment as to whether the following pages are worthy the great cause of human advancement in virtue and happiness, as they are intended, in however small degree, by

THE AUTHOR.

Missing Page

THE SOCIAL SCIENCE OF THE CONSTITUTION OF SOCIETY.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

‘Nature is conquered by obeying her.’—BACON.

THE German philosopher and poet, Goethe, tells us ‘the end of life is life itself.’ Assuming this affirmation to be correct, we are in duty bound to discriminate what in ‘life itself’ is to be cherished and cultivated, and what is to be mourned over and rooted out. This is our aim in regard to society, and that in no small particulars, requiring delicate sentiments, but in broad, general principles, which all may comprehend and judge for themselves.

Perhaps one of the broadest views of human nature is that which discriminates those phases of activities we name contentment, pure morality, happiness—in short, whatever is good, sincere, and elevating—in contradistinction from the multitude of vices and errors which are so deplorably prevalent in society. These two extremes

exist and have their connecting centre in ourselves, the same as heat and cold. We use science in regard to the latter, and may find a proper temperature for the body; but the former, if we use science—which is education in its broad sense—we use it to little purpose, for vices in every grade of life are as common as the virtues, while the latter ought to be as near as possible universal.

‘Europe (says George Combe) is at this moment only waking out of the slumbers of the dark ages; she is beginning to discover that she is ignorant, and to desire instruction. The sun of knowledge, however, is still below the horizon to vast multitudes of our British population; but they are startled by a bright effulgence darting from a radiant sky, and they now know that that light is the dawn of a glorious day, which will tend to terminate their troubled dreams of ignorance and folly. Help us to arouse them—let us lead them to pay their morning orisons in the great temple of universal truth. When they shall have entered into that temple, let us introduce them to nature and to nature’s God, and let us hasten the hour when the whole human race shall join together, to celebrate His power, wisdom, and goodness, in strains which will never cease till creation pass away; for we know that the sun of knowledge (unlike the orb of day), when once risen, will never set, but will continue to emit brighter and brighter rays, till time shall be no more. In eternity alone can we conceive the wonders of creation to be completely unfolded, and the mind of man to be satiated with the fulness of information.’

There is room for hope here, yet we need not be greatly surprised that we have not already attained a comparatively perfect practice in regard to pure wisdom and morality. The bright side of the picture we are most interested to understand and develope, as it is the most legitimate and noble end of life itself; but the dark side cannot but present itself till the light has its destined supremacy and universality. Some self-evident proverbial truths ought to effect a powerful influence on our practice; for what is pure and worthy in human actions are virtues necessarily connected with happiness, and their opposite vices, with their necessarily following misery. These are founded on God's works, consequently must stand, and the universally desirable phases ultimately triumph. This object is not only our duty, but interest prompts us to assist in their acceptance; in our judgment or choice they are intimately wrought with our own, our friends' and neighbours', and our children's happiness in all future time, for we may presume no sane person would prefer that which would lead to misery rather than to happiness. Yet this leads us to the greatest difficulty of all—the difficulty we would purposely combat—that there exist many influences in civilized society which prove themselves on us to be far more powerful than precepts known and acknowledged to be true and good. But in the best, or in the worst influences, habits ought to be kept as pure as possible, allowing the judgment and superior sentiments to acquire the habit of governing all the other impulses. Each person's judgment must dictate a given conduct, in pre-

ference to another which would involve personal disgrace and public censure. Education and general circumstances must favour this at an early period in individual lives, and then we may expect a healthy morality—a calm self-possession. The pernicious influences once withdrawn, the work of regeneration, or reformation of evil practice, will be as straight to the given goal as any work which is gone about in a scientific manner.

Public opinion, as an item of happiness in every respect except where it is irrational, tends to multiply itself and strengthen all virtuous sentiment. It is of the highest origin, as it is also of the highest value to humanity.

‘ Oh, Happiness! our being’s end and aim!

Good, pleasure, ease, content! whate’er thy name.’

—*Pope.*

Dr Franklin understood the nature of our subject well, and expresses himself thus—‘ The desire of happiness in general is so natural to us, that all the world are in pursuit of it ; all have this one end in view, though they take such different methods to attain it, and are so much divided in their notions of it. Evil, as evil, can never be chosen ; and though evil is often the effect of our own choice, yet we never desire it, but under the appearance of an imaginary good. Many things we indulge ourselves in may be considered by us as evils, and yet be desirable ; but then they are only considered as evils at present, and attended with immediate misery. There is no happiness, then, but in a virtuous and self-approving conduct ; unless our actions will bear the test of our sober judgment, and re-

flections upon them, they are not good actions, and consequently not the happiness of a rational being.' This happiness (or misery), though of no material existence in itself, is the blossom or the blessing which ought and naturally does co-exist along with all highly organised beings.

When misery has any predominance, nature is not obeyed, and it is a foolhardy game to play contra, when it must be all loss and no gain. However transitory happiness may appear, it has to exist and then it hath served its purpose; and in truth it stubbornly stands there the greatest blessing connected with our natural lives, and as congenial to our bodies as food or light. Why should it remain as a thing generally known and heard of, but never even one hope of its realisation? Experience in common life speaks only of toil, and care, and chagrin; most people bring their minds to them in time, if they do not succumb too soon, but how many heavy sighs and tears have to be endured? Instinct repels this antagonistic life, and we must give more heed to her promptings in the future if we would study our own interest. Nothing more than truth and justice is wanted or required. The harmonious spirit which exists throughout all natural phenomena will be the great purifier of our thoughts and aspirations. Herein we will find our most sacred duties and our individual rights; sufficient for us is the truth, and the truth will make us free, noble, and charitable. To live is to enjoy; to breathe is to breathe forth our blessed dependence, if we could but realise the true spirit.

Although we find the kernel of our subject within such narrow limits, let us not be deceived as to its early possession. The shell is to be got through which quite encloses the wished-for prize. And here again we find where the great amount of work is to be performed, not only in ourselves, but in the prejudice and error of others, and in enlightening the ignorant and unthinking. The majority of thinking people have their own notions of the baneful evils in society, and also of their cure; however vague and erroneous, they cannot be expected to throw them aside at once. Habit naturally confirms long received notions as part of our second nature; eradication is next to impossible. Paine, with his usual ability, says of this characteristic—‘A long habit of not thinking a thing *wrong* gives it a superficial appearance of being *right*, and raises at first a formidable outcry in defence of custom; but the tumult soon subsides. Time makes more converts than reason.’ Then, we have first the reformation which is essentially individual, in conforming our thoughts and actions with divine truth—the noblest standard the mind can conceive; and second, in regard to society, acquiring true knowledge in the place of error, and true social organisation in the place of peas-in-a-bushel unity, shams, straight-jacket positions, and the common strife in the fight of living. The former, namely self-culture, must become ours at whatever amount of perseverance; ‘the spirit must be willing however weak the flesh may prove.’

The great work of human happiness would have the best half accomplished were people generally determined on this; but to the latter we would refer more particularly.

We said, thinking people have theories of the evils that afflict and the benefits we may expect, for society ; but the truth is ever absolute, and when they are so many, and frequently diametrically opposite, there must be more error than truth. There being no standard but fact and human judgment, we ought to respect all who are sincere, however much disposed to combat the theories advanced. It is well for people to form opinions for themselves, giving the judgment its legitimate function to perform. Chesterfield is not far wrong on this point when he said — ‘ Consult your reason betimes. I do not say it will always prove an unerring guide—for human reason is not infallible—but it will prove the least erring guide you can follow.’ No single opinion in regard to the cause of the ills of life has gained so many respondents as that of Paul’s, in ‘ The love of money being the root of all evil ;’ yes, even by many comparatively enlightened men of the present day. But it is for us to judge if it is not more than a tool, a material servant in the hands of man, and that for any purpose. Opinions are not to be discussed here, but simply stated, to indicate the nature of the subject to which attention will be directed in the following pages.

Another, which had its day and made noise enough too, but has been put to bed and sleeps soundly now, was that of ‘ usury.’ Usury is an honourable transaction now-a-days. To annihilate money, says one class, and usury says another, would mitigate greatly the evils which society holds incorporated in its constitution. How many stick to idleness and imprudence being the

grand cause of evil? and, consequently, industry and economy the saving potion of diseased society. Drunkenness, and extravagance in dress fall in for their share. 'It is ordinarily much easier to point out evils, and even to indicate their causes, than to suggest the remedies. We are all agreed that there are evils, but public opinion is at present very much divided as regards both causes and remedies, and perhaps most parties err more from taking a partial or confined view than from that view being absolutely mistaken. Machinery is the cause, says one; it is over-production and over-trading, says another; it is corn laws and the want of free trade; it is the currency and joint-stock banks; it is class legislation; it is deficiency of education and religious instruction, and the improvident habits of the working classes, say others—and probably all are right.' Machinery is not unfrequently named the civiliser and improver of the fortune of the poorer classes in particular; Britain could not hold the wealth and position she does without her enormous mechanical appliances. Where they are most extensively in use wages are often comparatively high, and high wages are looked upon by some people as the remedy for society's ailments; but would there be less social tyranny and corruption were the wages up to the desired ideal?—or are they who enjoy large wages satisfied, or all that could be desired morally?

The last to which we will at present make reference is that in regard to religion. The clergy have become famous, since the time of Galileo, to thrust objections against whatever had for its object human advancement,

on religious grounds entirely.—This is no less futile than politically false. They tell us we are not to hope, by human endeavour, to radically ameliorate and perfect the lot and character of man. This is supposed to be beyond our power, and to attempt it will in the consequences not only fail but involve and deserve punishment. This great work is left for special interference from Deity, who alone is conceived capable to undertake its accomplishment. It is almost superfluous to say we shall never subscribe to this stationary, blasphemous, and certainly derogatory doctrine. All our experience in the progress our race has undergone makes us the more certain that Deity requires us to work out all our own material welfare ; even as all our acquirements in science and art have been exclusively by the thought of our brain and the strength of our arm. No exception to these have existed in the past ; then why listen to the chronic wailings or teachings of a barbaric age ? When Deity is made to play a part in essentially mundane and secular concerns, it indicates a degree of superstition which is anything but creditable to the citizen. The Deity requires not such lame and absurd attributes as are involved in such puny work—in fact, to admit it would destroy the infinite sublimity manifested throughout the whole of creation. Surely, when the nature of things is so perfect, we need not construe them with the artificial relationships of life, which gives man room for his activity, glory, and scope for his ingenuity. All God's works teach and necessarily require of us to learn the use of our powers, by way of perfecting ourselves in all that is noble and good, thus

perfecting ourselves in a finite degree as followers in practice ought the Infinite and All-perfect. This is self-evident to thinking people, and perfectly satisfactory. Then our duty is clear—to follow truth to the utmost in our power, discarding the prejudices and tyranny which have grown up with our race to its shame, reading us a lesson of the darkness dominant in bygone ages, when our own judgment enables us to be certain.

The question of special providence and science is put thus by Dr A. Combe:—‘The question thus just comes to be, whether it is more humble and respectful in us to study what are really the decrees of the Divine will, and endeavour to act in accordance with them, as the surest way to obtain God’s blessing on our efforts; or to shut our eyes to the means by which He acts and manifests His will, and, while paying him a well-meant but blind homage, to disregard or even run counter to his instructions, in the vain hope that, in compassion for our weakness, He will alter the order of nature in our favour?’

Leaving these narrow causes and medicinal cures of afflicted society, with the assurance they fall far short of the organic disease and remedy, we may find some indications of a more profound philosophy or science not unknown in present society, and that as briefly as possible. There is no question that the evils in society have their primary cause in the false, as it will be expected their cure will be found in absolute truth. We will present some of the indications of the evils—of what is, but what ought not to be, in the first instance; and second, some hints of what society requires, and must ultimately possess.

Individual experience speaks to the effect that the relative amount of happiness enjoyed is not quite sufficient for nature's demand; in fact, that misery, whether as chagrin or ennui, absorbs an unaccountable amount of our time. No doubt, different natures find different degrees of enjoyment in as nearly as possible the same circumstances or external conditions; but we must not needlessly question dispositions, for they are divine; the social and industrial constitution of society are in our power, and must be adapted to the variety, placing all so as to have one interest and one good. Peace, liberty of conscience, healthy employment, &c., &c., are equally adapted for all the variety of human natures. But the partitioning of the earth and all necessities of life into mine and thine, were it ever so equitably performed, could never suit the various dispositions—could never bring happiness—but could show the weaknesses and foibles of our natures, according to the development of that principle.

If we come to a particular class of our population, what misery may be imagined from this alone?—‘Our paupers are one million and a-half, and our criminals a million.’ It is to be hoped these positions sit lighter on their shoulders than they would on many others. Let us hear what the author of ‘The Philosophy of Necessity’ says of our present system of society:—‘It is evident that the error of our present system lies in its defective and false organization, and that the reform required is neither political nor administrative, but social. We become so accustomed to the form of society under which

we live, that its institutions, laws, and customs are a second nature to us, and we never suspect that the evils that surround us, and against which we are struggling, are inherent in the very framework of our social system. This social system, which appears to us so natural, unchangeable, and perfect, is nevertheless built upon the predominance of individual self-interest, and is therefore totally out of harmony with the very laws of our being. Providence has so built *us*, that we cannot be happy if our fellow-creatures are miserable; and what we require is a skilful combination of all the powers we possess for the general good. A family should consist, not of a man's own household merely, but of as many as are necessary to produce and consume everything that the highest wants of the family require. The objects proposed by such an association are *harmony of means*, *unity of purpose*, and, what can never be acquired under the present system, *justice in distribution*. To production only have we hitherto attended, and we are now beginning to be aware that distribution is equally important.'

The same author quotes from Thomas Carlyle's 'Past and Present':—'All this mammon-gospel of supply and demand, competition, *laissez-faire*, and devil-take-the-hindmost, begins to be one of the shabbiest gospels ever preached on earth; or altogether the shabbiest.' Sidney Smith, in 'The Mother Country,' says:—'It is no use that we prove progress in material wealth, if we also establish an increase of real misery to a greater extent still. What are all our imports, and exports, and accumulations, if we do no more with them than swell the

number of bankrupts, paupers, and criminals? This, indeed, is the least consolatory view of our condition. We possess all the materials which are supposed to lead to ^{con-}fort, order, intelligence, and virtue, and are still ^{more} at times more the children of the devil than we were before." We might hope, if we were poor, to make a better use of our resources, and become rich; but having riches, and being socially poor, is the saddest of spectacles. Our misery lies in this, that having the good things of this world we know not how to use them; we know the science of getting, not the more difficult art of wisely spending.' We may take only one other authority on another phase of the shady side of present society, the Rev. Dr W. Knox, who says:—'Many who have arisen to high elevation of rank or fortune seem to think that their nature has undergone a real metamorphosis; that they are refined by a kind of chemical process, sublimed by the sunshine of royal favour, and separated from the fæces, the dross, and the dregs of ordinary humanity—that humanity of which the mass of mankind partake, and which, imperfect as it is, God created. They seem to themselves raised to a pinnacle, from which they behold, with sentiments of indifference or contempt, all two-legged and unfeathered beings of inferior order, placed in the vale, as ministers of their pride and slaves to their luxury, or else burdens of the earth and *superfluous sharers* of existence.'

Now we may have a few specimens of authorities, as indicating the remedy. Let no one deceive himself that it is entirely an outward principle, for the truth is, the

outward or available natural principle is depending upon the inward state of mens' minds, their intelligence, love to man, and sense of justice. For the primary mode to effect this we may quote from 'The Christian Philosopher':—'In short, a devout contemplation of the works of nature tend to ennoble the human soul, and to purify and exalt the affections.' And again, in reference to man's relation to nature—'All proclaim the benevolence of our Almighty Maker, and show that the communication of happiness is one grand object of all His arrangements.' Or take Theodore Parker:—'Love to God was no abstraction. It implied love of wisdom, justice, purity, goodness, holiness, charity. To love these, is to love God; to *love* them, is to *live* them.' 'The other doctrine, Love to Man, is love of all as yourself, not because they have no faults, but in spite thereof. To feel no enmity towards enemies; to labour for them with love; pray for them with pitying affection, remembering that the less they deserve the more they need; this was the doctrine of Love. It demands that the rich, the wise, the holy, help the poor, the foolish, the sinful; that the strong bear the burdens of the weak, not bind them anew. It tells a man that his excellence and ability are not for himself alone, but for all mankind, of which he is but one, beginning first with the nearest of the needy. It makes the strong the guardians, not the tyrants of the weak.'

So much for the internal part of the remedy; now we may hear Thomas Carlyle in regard to the external:—
'All human interests, combined human endeavours, and

social growths in this world have, at a certain stage of their development, required organising; and Work, the grandest of human interests, does now require it. The shadow on the dial advances henceforth without pausing. What government can do? This that they call "Organisation of Labour," is, if well understood, the problem of the whole future, for all who would in future pretend to govern men.'

In 'The Friend of the People' for 1851, Louis Blanc, author of the 'Organization of Labour,' writes:—"What is association? It is that principle by which men, instead of isolating themselves, fighting for life and fortune as for some booty, and tearing each other to pieces, are led to harmonise their wills, to combine their talents, and work together at a common task, of which each would receive the fruits according to his wants, after having contributed to the production in proportion to his abilities." What are the results of association? Love, the harmony of the individual with the general interest, and, consequently, an honourable emulation; the introduction of science in the place of chance; the unlimited increase of public wealth by a scientific combination of the various powers of nature, and its distribution according to the various wants of the individuals; in one word, the real practice of Christianity—Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.'

William Thomson, in his 'Appeal for Women,' says:—"The scheme of association, or mutual co-operation, where all useful talents and efforts for the common good will be equally appreciated and rewarded, is the true

haven for the happiness of both sexes, particularly women. All motives are here taken away from men to practise injustice—all motives are taken away from women to submit to injustice. The practice of it will not, therefore, be attempted. As long as the exclusive individual possession of wealth remains the moving-spring of human society, so long will your peculiar pains and privations be disregarded and unrequited, and man will avail himself of his natural advantages of strength and uninterrupted exertion to exact an indirect domination over woman in the secrecy of domestic life, though laws and public opinion were opposed to such usurpation. It is not in human nature, possessed of power and the means of exercising it, and acting in everything by means of competition, to abstain on all occasions from the abuse of that power. By mutual co-operation of large numbers, the power and the means of exercising it are equally withdrawn. Women are here no more dependent on men, or on any individual man, than men are on women.'

Allow the gifted Shelley to say a word here :—'I will not insult common sense by insisting on the doctrine of the natural equality of man. The question is not concerning its desirableness, but its practicability; so far as it is practicable, it is desirable.' And again :—'The whole of human science is comprised in one question : How can the advantages of intelligence and civilisation be reconciled with the liberty and pure pleasures of a natural life?'

Political Economy—Association is there any other

which these do not represent? If not, which shall we choose? We shall give audience to another—George Combe, in his ‘Moral Philosophy:’—‘As the firmest believers in man’s capability of improvement are those persons who themselves possess a high moral development of brain, they are inspired in this faith, not by a demon, but by Heaven, for the moral sentiments are the God-like element of nature; and the very fact that these ennobling expectations are entertained by men possessing the best moral affections, affords an indication that Providence intends they should be realised. In proportion, then, as a large development of the organs of the higher faculties become general, the conviction of the possibility of improvement, the desire for it, and the power of realising it, will increase.’ In conclusion, perhaps, we might discourage the idea of here finding a finished picture, or more than a common etching; hence we could not say otherwise than with the Rev. Thomas Pearson, in his *Essay on Infidelity*—‘Divine truth is, from its very nature, imperishable; whereas error, however mischievous in its influence for the time, is doomed to destruction.’ Or with the Rev. W. Knox ‘*On Despotism*’:—‘I endeavour in this book to plead the cause of man, firmly convinced that the cause of man is the cause of God.’

CHAPTER II.

PRESENT STATE OF SOCIETY.

IF there ever was anything good in the principle of Society, it belongs to the modern more than to that of the past. That the race have progressed in wealth, virtue, and happiness, cannot be called in question. Since this is the fact, we will be taking very proper grounds in examining the constitution of society, as it at present exists, rather than that of any phase of the past. This, then, will be the immediate subject of discussion.

There are certain preliminaries in all departments of learning, which are self-evident, or facts of individual cognizance in nature: such as letters in regard to language; of knowledge, existence itself must be the evident standard of appeal and foundation; of music, we will find it in simple sounds; geometry has figures, and arithmetic has numerical figures: every department of science (and science embraces all real knowledge) has its preliminary assumptions, or foundations, and what are those of society? What is the first link which binds and forms the basis of people living in this state of present society? Society has foundation in private or individual property. This is the primary assumption of modern and historic society. In any examination of the constitution of society, therefore, it is of vast importance

to see clearly the truth at the basis. What is this private or personal property? Every one knows this by every-day experience. It is the exclusive right to use or abuse whatever is held as property. Members of the human family have been and are still held as property : natural right must be entirely thrown aside here, for the slave may as justly hold the slaveholder as a chattel as the slave is at present held. It is certainly a great anomaly that man may be either the property or the proprietor of man. Both cannot be in accordance with nature. And if we might err in holding man as property, how much more readily may we err in holding anything else? The idea of property, then, may be purely questionable, and the investigation of its intrinsic truth is of first importance, to see if it is justified by natural existence, and consequently whether it is, or is not, of Divine origin.

This is not the place to enquire whether man must conceive nature or creation as eternal, or as the work of the Almighty God. Whichever of these it may be, its essential nature will be the same, and this is what we have to do with; for the great principles and facts in the universe are open, cognizant to all who are led to observe, and are our principal reliance, and generally least the subject of dispute. But truly these speculative opinions are not opposed to each other; only they go different degrees into the deep subject. The first gives prominence only to what is popularly called 'ocular demonstration'; but this must include all mental perceptions and deductions from outwardly observed facts—assuming substance and connected power or vitality,

in its origin and present manifestation, eternal. The second sees all this the same, but requires by apparent necessity some Infinite Power superior to the material creation, and for the purpose of giving that infinite beauty manifested in the natural world. The first deifies nature; the second makes nature the handiwork of adorable Deity; so that in either case nature is divine—above human power and wisdom, and consequently perfectly suitable to form a standard of human notions. The stability of nature is unquestioned by either for the unchangeable condition of what is permanent, and the uniformity of natural vital forces or laws gives man a certainty and serenity pleasant to the recipient to conceive, and not less subservient in all works of utility. With this view of nature as an available, just standard of truth and error, we approach the question—Whether it justifies the idea and holding of individual property?

We find in the Book of Psalms, that ‘the earth is the Lord’s, and the fulness thereof’; and the same idea is to be heard from the pulpit very frequently. This gives us to understand nothing can become the property of man; things are neither mine nor thine, but belong to our Creator—the use of them is understood to be the normal condition. But who expects those who preach this unselfish doctrine, and those who listen to it, to carry it into daily practice—to repudiate absolute possession in property? In the American Slave States similar fine words may be eloquently held forth just as often as with us. So, if we are to be men in our manhood, these child-

ish characteristics must pass from us, and speak what we think and practise what we profess. As we may hear to no purpose property discussed from the pulpit, we return to nature to work out our problem, to inhale power to create the vital principle and practice which accords most with truth. One would think to hold anything as property there should be a *natural connection* between the two—a self-evident dependence of the property on the proprietor ; but nothing of the kind exists. The strongest position, and nearest approach to truth in the idea of property we can conceive, is that in ourselves belonging to ourselves. If we have one particle of right to property, we have it in and over our own persons. But have we even this ? Does it not remind us of blasphemy ? Are we not dependent creatures ?—dependent soul and body on nature or nature's God ! Yes, and also on our fellow-beings. We are not even independent of man ; for surely to have an absolute right to assist or not assist our fellow-beings we must be independent of them ; but this belongs not to us. And if dependent, how can we rationally hold ourselves as our own exclusively—for ourselves alone ? Dependence, by moral law, assumes duties in return ; and the moral principles of our nature prompt over and above those to virtuous duties whenever they can be rendered. And these moral sentiments imply social life for mutual kindnesses, at the same time that they repudiate any selfish release from moral duties. And what becomes of the idea of exclusive property of one's self ? It is simply usurpation, not only over ourselves in relation to others, but over the divine constitution of nature. We have

no good authority for holding ourselves exclusively for ourselves, and much less for others holding us exclusively for themselves. What is true in regard to us is true in regard to all the human race. To render service is duty, but to command others to our service is pure and direct tyranny.

It must be observed we are parts of the great work of God in Creation, and belong to that which is animate and rational; indeed, the superior in it in a comparative degree—the very uppermost stone of this wondrously beautiful planet. From this view of the matter, man, in assuming property, assumes what there is not one particle of authority to support him; nature spurns such practice, whether it be in a spirit of grasping ambition, sordid accumulation, or silly weakness, they emanate from man, and are entirely on man's authority. Neither is there necessity in support of this idea of property, for while everything calls us to the exercise of our faculties in the production of the necessities and luxuries of life, what could be more rational than the use and enjoyment of these productions in a state of union? We use the atmosphere in respiration; but what presumption to call this portion mine, and that thine? Such ridiculous and false ideas have no share in living well and happy; to do our duties, and properly use the blessings of life, we require nothing opposed to absolute truth and a gentle humility. And it will be evident there is an assumption in the principle of property essentially different from the simple use of the innumerable blessings of life. In fact, the power to abuse, and the methods of abuse are

thousands. The inebriated man is the ever-ready illustration; abuse of wine, spirits, or strong liquor; and he vainly thinks that abuse of himself as well as the drink which was his own is simple matter for his own consideration and to nobody else. What plausibility there is in this is entirely due to the property principle, which gives us absolute mastery over self and property, while neither nature nor reason gives it; the latter rather leaving us in a dependence which is no burden, but pregnant with happiness. It must always remain a matter of pure conjecture, the enormous amount of waste time and wealth, which is perfectly unnecessary, but which is continually going on. Three months' strikes here and there of so many hundreds or thousands of people are calculated in pounds, shillings, and pence; yet this would be only a drop in the bucket of the many abuses for which present society's constitution is accountable. Also, the many wants among the great majority of people of things which exist in abundance—these not only ought to be supplied, but their enjoyment would greatly elevate the character of those who used them—such as scientific and all first-class books, all sorts of instruments for the prosecution of the arts, by way of self-culture. In present society this is impossible; every step demands money, and many young men hurt themselves by supplying elevating aspirations, and others by want of proper discretion in this particular never have much self-culture; but neither ought ever to have suffered. Others with less disposition for the arts suffer the wants they may possess to die, because the expense is impossible

to be borne; thus they all suffer, in a natural sense, for want of mental development—the one from the effects of ministering to his love of the arts, the other by his circumstances in life rendering the development of his love of arts of no avail. The characters of both are essentially injured—we have castles in the air without foundation in the one case, and in the other a repressed structure for want of material. We have somewhat digressed from the subject of the nature of property to its effects in society; and seeing this we will introduce an extract from John Locke on ‘Civil Government,’ which is to the point, and the author a well known authority:—‘Whether we consider natural reason, which tells us, that men, being once born, have a right to their preservation, and consequently to meat and drink, and such other things as nature affords for their subsistence; or revelation, which gives us an account of those grants God made of the world to Adam, and to Noah and his sons, it is very clear, that God, as King David says, Psal. cxv. 16, “has given the earth to the children of men;” given it to mankind in common. But this being supposed, it seems to some a very great difficulty how any should ever come to have a property in any thing. I will not content myself to answer that if it be difficult to make out property, upon a supposition that God gave the world to Adam and his posterity in common, it is impossible that any man, but one universal monarch, should have any property, upon a supposition that God gave the world to Adam and his heirs in succession, exclusive of all the rest of his posterity. But

I shall endeavour to show how men might come to have a property in several parts of that which God gave to mankind in common, and that without any express compact of all the commoners.' This speaks for itself. The exclusive possession by heirship is given up, and the statement in the last period quoted is well carried out, but this object is giving the 'earth to the children of men' for personal property. Why take this for granted? Why! the earth is given to the children of men only for use. In establishing property, the following is one of the strongest arguments:—'Though the earth and all inferior creatures be common to all men, yet every man has a property in his own person: this nobody has any right to but himself. The labour of his body, and the work of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever then he removes out of the state that nature hath provided and left it in, he has mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property. It being by him removed from the common state nature hath placed it in, it hath by this labour something annexed to it that excludes the common right of other men: for this labour being the unquestionable property of the labourer, no man but he can have a right to what that is once joined to, at least where there is enough and as good left in common for others.' There is some force in this, and which might give a comparative right—a right which may be acknowledged without a properly constituted society: but the applicability had been questioned in his own mind since he added, 'at least where there is enough

and as good left in common for others.' This will not suit us who are in society, and intend to remain in society, and would like to have a share of the blessings which naturally flow from the bounty of nature. It will be seen, first, that property is assumed in our own person; second, labour bestowed on unclaimed nature is assumed to give basis to external property: these establishing right of exclusive property. Can we serve two masters? We must choose the natural, with its duties, worth, and privileges; or we must choose the artificial, with its selfishness, corruption, and coercive laws. If our nature is a part and in accordance with the whole creation, and, in particular, bound up with the human race, there is not a shadow of evidence to support, nor justification to continue in the debasing meshes of selfishness. Self-appropriation is poison to benevolent and generous sentiments, violates the harmonies of our nature, and will continue to do so until we recognise the double dependence we are placed in—divine and human. We said a few words already on our person being not our own, and need not again repeat it. We cannot be our own when we are not independent, and, if not our own, our labour is not altogether ours either. After the natural and social duties are performed, then we may labour and establish comparative right; but this must be a thing of leisure time, and not generally of first importance. Hence it is delusion to reason of labour establishing the basis of property, because it in the main is pre-occupied; it cannot in nature nor in reason withdraw itself from family and social duties and privileges. And if it could, is it desirable?

Let us sketch a sample character, duly influenced by the common Mammon principle, independent and selfish. Behold a child gifted with good capacities, mental and physical, fortunate in having dutiful, patient, and affectionate parents. The neighbours are friendly and kind, want is unknown, and the duties imposed are principally, if not altogether, for his own interest. Proper teachers for his education are enjoyed, and expense is not spared to thoroughly accomplish our sample character. Thus this happy 'child of circumstances' is matured, and begins acting on his own account. He acquires pocket-money, and loves his accumulations; soon totally forgets to be kind to others, as others have been to him. Looking about, he soon finds means to accelerate his accumulations by engaging others, whose necessities force them, and who are simple enough to slave for him for little more than the physical necessities of life and a few words of encouragement. He gains faster than ever, and is now richer than the class among whom he has been bred. The poor, the purseless, he is shocked with—reminding him of their wants and his power to relieve them, which is not to be expected. He did not get his money that way, and attributes their misery and wretchedness to indolence and want of economy, although he can roughly guess they have been industrious, but the weekly earnings would not average the paltry sum necessary for decent comfort. It is not his business if they have had to assist their parents and other members of their family, and have had no patrimony that could be reserved. He likes people to take care of themselves; and if they will not, then they must

just suffer the consequences. Duties of life become absorbed into selfish independence; obligations of money or debts are all fulfilled, or may be fulfilled; consequently his is the freest of the free in regard to all personal duties to be performed. There are many noble and pure channels of emulation, according to nature, but these have all been turned into one narrow and deep enough—the pure influences of property, the artificial and corroding worship of Mammon. Did nature bestow high faculties for pure selfishness? Did his parents deserve neglect in the sunset of their days—nearly contempt, for their means was just barely sufficient, having used their income, spending it freely for their child, and other duties of life? And who can say that one heart has been lightened by his benignant smile and offering? None, truly none. Property in his life is no dead institution, but its very mainspring. And who dare affirm himself free from its polluting power? It forces itself on all, but in different degrees; makes the noble nature simply good, the good by nature it turns out quite indifferent, and the indifferent into positive stains on the family of man. Let us, then, understand the intrinsic nature of property. Are we to assume God gives us life, and health, and power, and wisdom, for to claim rights purely selfish—leaving the nobler duties to take care of themselves? Are we to assume God enjoins us to establish this purely selfish principle into a fundamental constitution for society, now and for ever? God forbids. Nature abhors. We must abjure this, and act humbly in our twofold dependence, if we would enjoy the blessings intended by our Infinite Parent. The idea

of absolute property is false, and the practice of it proves it beyond question in the effects produced. A few words now and more particularly on the right to unclaimed substance, which has had labour added to it. It is true, if it is proper for man to assume property, that the person who expends labour on any given material has a more legitimate right to that thing than others who have on it bestowed no labour. But this admission gives no support to the false principle of property. Seeing, as we do, primary ideas to that of right by labour, which preclude us from assuming power or right to hold things as property, consequently it seems impossible to substantiate this by labour. Labour is simply action, useful action; in a general sense, particularly for the production of the necessities and luxuries of life. It cannot be amalgamated into the material, but must remain only the thing directing or acting on it. We may fertilise land, sow corn, and reap the harvest; in all we have not added one atom, but simply directed the impulses of nature for our own purposes by action. Those who fell trees, cut them up, and form the timber into useful purposes, do stand identically in the same relation. To manufacture corn, milk, or eggs, sounds strange only to those unaccustomed to conceive of them in this light. But, in reality, the feller of wood, the sower and reaper of corn, and he who makes thread into cloth, are all equally manufacturers, or labourers, if the term suit or appear preferable, but the idea intended is the same, that all work is simply intelligent, useful, and voluntary action—the grand object of all being the production of the necessities and

luxuries of life. Animate beings may effect peculiar conditions on natural phenomena, but change nothing in the nature of things; our action in nature is limited, neither the creation nor destruction of one single atom being within our power. 'We sow, but God giveth the increase.' Sowing here is illustrative of our power or action; God, of the substance and all vital action. Having seen this much, it must be evident 'proprietyship' is no less presumptuous than unfounded. But supposing labour was sufficient to establish absolute property; also, suppose property was in the main established by labour, without violence, usurpation, confiscations, or other malicious injustice in the present and past, the question would instantly arise—Do we universally or in the majority desire the establishment of the individual property system of society? This question is fair and of first importance, and which ought to be taken up individually by all. Do we prefer individual interests to interests in common? If our answer be in the affirmative, we are as we desire and deserve to be: if in the negative, then organise and patiently wait. Ultimately nature's lesson must be read, that mutual help in labour, and mutual enjoyment of the products of labour, is the only true, and consequently the only right constitution of society. How do we find life in the present constitution of society? Are we in a position to be satisfied either with the duties or the enjoyments? These are the fruits by which to judge the tree, but we may also judge whether we sow wheat or tares. It need not be neglected that happiness is the grand mundane effect desired by all

sensate beings, and the human race are no exception. This may be difficult to digest, looking only superficially to the experience of every day life or history; but the criterion of nature supports the fact. Men, by ignorance, distorted beliefs, and base motives, may act what appears to others entirely opposed to this truism of happiness being the element and object of our race. But here man is the author of his own misery. Society's constitution cannot change the true into the false; yet it alone not only darkens this principle of happiness which ought to be clear as any other essential truth, but misdirects all individuals in making possession of property necessarily a primary condition to any continuance of rational enjoyment. Hence, in a great degree, the race of mankind, in their search for happiness, find it directed into a 'search for wealth'—the necessities and luxuries of life. Few or none are entirely satisfied, not even those who worship the gold till the purse is both a burden and a feeble comfort—those, above all, who have gained the prize their ambition was set on.

We may take another view of the desirability of the individual property principle: from Plato's 'Republic' the following dialogue:—'A state then, said I, takes its rise, methinks, because none of us individually happens to be self-sufficient, but stands in need of many things; do you think there is any other origin of the settlement of a state? None, said he. Thus, then, one assisting one person for the want of one thing, and another for the want of another, as we stand in need of many things, we collect into one dwelling many

companions and assistants, and to this joint dwelling we give the name of a city; do we not? Certainly.' Again, he represents a husbandman, a builder, a weaver, a shoemaker, in the origin of his 'state' illustration, and adds, 'What, then? must each of these contribute work for the whole in common?—as, for instance, must the husbandman, though only one, provide food for four, and spend fourfold time and labour in providing food and sharing it with the others? or is he, without any care for them, to prepare for himself alone the fourth of this food in the fourth part of the time, while the other three parts of his time, he employs one in providing a house, another clothing, and the other shoes, and not trouble himself to share with others, but give his whole attention to his own affairs?' And Adimandus said—'Ay, but perhaps the former way, Socrates, is easier than the latter. By Zeus (Jupiter), that is not amiss, said I—for while you are speaking, I am thinking that first of all we are born, not each other perfectly alike to each, but differing in disposition—one fitted for doing one thing, and another for another; does it not seem so to you? It does.'

There was the ancient philosopher speculating three hundred and fifty years before our present era; it suits for a primitive state well, and in principle is a simple illustration for the modern also. Work must be performed; the produce must be distributed. Will we accept a certain just principle which is simple as it is effective? or will we continue a hap-hazard, irresponsible principle as that of individual property? Are we disposed to give

all people an interest in performing necessary work and duties? or will we distrust each other, and give wages to use or abuse, as the discretion or passions are predominant? Are we determined in making patriotic citizens of all? or are we pleased with many degraded, time-serving drudges? Make the question a family one, by supposing we were isolated from the rest of mankind, or the only inhabitants of an island country, and the earth surrounding us, are we individually to claim as private property or simply to cultivate according to our mutual wants? Will each able-bodied member isolate himself from the others within the boundary called his own, manufacture all for himself, and contribute part thereof to support those aged or otherwise unable to provide for themselves? or would they better live friendly together, each doing what he best could and was most necessary, for the whole, and the whole doing the same for him, the aged or disabled being supported along with the other members, without stain of honour or reproach? We hold the isolation mode to be selfish, defeating its own hopes and promises, and the principle false; separate purses, equally with separate claims of the earth, divide what ought to be union and a power of strength.

Man, the subject of innumerable gifts and blessings in his own nature, in the sociality of his neighbour, in the greatest men of the past, who have written the thoughts and feelings of animated and inanimated nature, all contributing to his joy—shall the subject of half these blessings be unwilling to assist and assure, and in return be assisted and assured, in the material comforts of life

with his fellow-beings? To affirm this there must erroneously appear some peculiar charm in selfish independence and isolation; no doubt, in these conditions the poverty-stricken unfortunates can be denied the wherewithal to satisfy the cravings of hunger by those so disposed, but such conditions can only be supported by a miserable few who would be guilty of such conduct. Perhaps a much larger number hurt themselves by giving more charity than they can, with all debts paid, afford. Extremes we can scarce avoid running into, for we are in practical conditions similar to him who answers a question which is definitely and properly unanswerable. Charity, or relief of the poor, is peculiarly and permanently connected with the selfish, independent principle of property—the one is the legitimate consequence of the establishment of the other. And the uncertainty as to how our fellow-creatures are supported must be a continual source of anxiety to benevolently disposed and comfortably conditioned individuals. Nor can any thought or action of an individual greatly mitigate or stem the unwholesome current. Give all that you have to the poor, and the poor are very immaterially altered. Why so? For the conditions that give rise to that poverty are active as ever, creating them faster than we possibly could put them on proper supplies. We refer, of course, to all who suffer from poverty, but publicly are never known. Every person has a spark of nature originally in him, however much it may be darkened by the corrupt influences of society; hence the common feeling to mitigate misery wherever it exists. What suffering is not endured before

charity is asked? Who would not loathe the system of charity if its necessity was not urgent? Would one nation or employed workman take alms from another nation or workman? The utmost disdain would be experienced and expressed. Why should any of our race be necessitated into such unmanly conditions? Why is it possible? Nor is the giver without taint, who makes a parade or takes merit in deeds of pecuniary beneficence. The subject is fraught with the most mournful conditions possible for God's creatures to be placed in by necessity; but that necessity is founded on our own ignorance, which truth will dispel, with its thousand-and-one evils. We have showed, first, the intrinsic idea of property is essentially false, because, if any thing can be viewed as property, it must belong alone to God; and, second, that labour cannot establish any system of property, because it assumes more than any human action could justify and support. Indeed, we have seen it was not desirable, if it could be established on one or other of these foundations.

But the fact that property has been established—that it is the foundation of present society—not only justifies but necessitates us to endeavour an analysis. Nothing can be more rational than properly understanding the constitution of society of which we form a citizen, and with which we would interfere. We must also acknowledge that any radical interference which would leave society worse than we found it would be absolute madness; but it is clearly our duty to endeavour, and our ever-enlarging experience and intelligence gives hope

we may by our interference leave society greatly superior. We cannot attempt to particularise society's characteristics—enough if we can point to some leading features, as they appear on the surface; to this end our observations must be limited. There are a few phases which attract attention on the most superficial view of society; such as the universal pursuit after money, wealth, or property; the competition we hear of and see continually in this pursuit; the disappointment of the great majority of this number; *the irritation, or congenial nature all, or nearly all*, find their occupations or positions in life; the extremes of affluence and poverty, and also of education and ignorance; the narrowness each person maintains, being limited to his own sphere in society—and the spheres or classes in society are innumerable, while our natures are one, and tend to unity; the common wants which are never realised, yet all that is required for that purpose is in abundance in society. Others, with superabundance of means, and time unoccupied, are like to die of ennui, while work could be engaged in delightful and useful, but not imposed by necessity; the aspiration to gentility with empty pockets; fine large airy houses with only two or three occupants, and other old hovels of equal size with their fifty or an hundred inmates packed to suffocation; and so take good-bye of this inexhaustible catalogue with our thousands of bachelors who cannot find sufficiently favourable circumstances to make themselves and others happy, by marrying the thousands of unmarried women. Are these unnatural conditions in society without meaning? Are

they not felt? Is their positive continuance not an unbearable evil? We may see how impossible it is for us to rise above comparative poverty: to be at the oar while strength remaineth, and after that in life's ebbing tide, is a gloomy mixture of hope and despair. In youth, let wants be few, and nature's seal on them; for things wanted for an hour, a day, or a month, cannot be commanded without entailing a burden on all after life. We must succumb to the drivelling spirit in good time, when we cannot hope to prudentially be master in life's circumstances; for no greater tyrant exists than the individual-property principle. For the poor, whose lives are exhausted by toil to procure sufficient just to live, a month's salary could not be wanted. These are its slaves. It has its courtiers or flatterers too, among those who have risen, by foul means in particular, to selfish independence. How many rise even to this independence from personal labour of actual utility, and have enjoyed a moderate amount of common luxuries during the acquisition.

CHAPTER III.

PRESENT STATE OF SOCIETY.

MONEY has been used to such an extent by society as almost to have been amalgamated with it, and on that account we shall state what it is, and how necessary in its constitution. Money has been said to be the root of all evil: how far it has to do with this connection, perhaps, will be made clear. The simplest view of gold, silver, &c., probably is the most correct—namely, scarce metals which represent comparative quantities of labour, and used as a circulating medium in exchanging equal quantities of labour in the production of the necessities and luxuries of life. Gold is the product of labour, the same as corn or broadcloth; a sovereign's worth of either represents the same expense in labour or profit as the sovereign itself. Were it not used as a circulating medium, its relative value would scarcely be altered; and the increasing requirements for it as that medium have been quite equal to the extraordinary production of it during the last twelve years. Although gold is not likely to decrease in value for many years to come, this is by no means impossible. Were it to be produced with the same amount of labour as silver, 'the rush' would bring its value down of a necessity; but small differences cannot act, since the demand is so extensive, and the

establishment of it as a standard of value so common among the whole civilised race of man.

The same article may at different times be exchanged for a more or less quantity of gold ; but the probability is, that the production of that article has been found to be of less or more quantity of labour at the different periods—hence the change of price. A good harvest of all agricultural products, and the prices will be comparatively low, and scarce crops of one or more articles will render them high. Here we have the same article exchanging for more or less gold ; but the cause is evident—the less or more labour, or other expenditure, to bring the article to the same labour or expenditure that the gold is assumed to be. Gold is not only a representative of value, but real value ; and hence it is the first necessity in all trading or commercial transactions. Gold, as a medium, steps into the place of bartering or exchanging goods or commodities for goods ; instead of that we have now goods for gold, which facilitates exchanges by not incommoding the exchangers with goods they do not require, and do not occupy a position to sell them again. Merchants have their given articles of exchange ; these they find sufficient to command their whole attention, so that other sorts of goods thrown on their hands would suit little better than if a manufacturer of cloth were to be paid for a quantity of that article with a handsome mansion at Land's-End. There are two at a bargain, and each who exchanges labour or merchandise requires gold to some extent, and most people to a very great, or the whole extent of the price ; and if exchanges take place,

they are still in money, and the balance sent to whom it belongs. This is, no doubt, an unquestionable improvement on barter, which is not out of date yet, although almost so, in Britain.

It is a common remark among traders that 'Every person is in want of money.' There is more assiduity and labour generally applied in selling articles and collecting the money than in paying it, and the exchanges which lead to the collecting of it are done to an advantage—forming the income of those engaged. All retail dealers pay money away in comparatively large sums, and generally collect it in small ones—always eager for gold in exchange for commodities; and they find, in turn, wholesale merchants eager for their gold again for replenishing stock, or perhaps by a tempting figure and rising market, and having the same interest in exchanging for gold as the retail merchant. Paper money has both advantages and disadvantages. L.1000 in gold is expected to bring its interest per annum, even as a house valued at L.1000 is expected to bring its rent, to the proprietor of either; but if we put L.1000 of paper money in its place, which it is admirably fitted for, simply as a circulating medium, the interest is pure gain to the nation, as the cost of its manufacture is next to nothing. This is the bright side of the circulating paper medium. The dark side is in the fictitious value of the paper; people know its true value, and the bankruptcy of a bank director, or many other incidental causes, makes a terrible panic and demand for the money of intrinsic value—gold. Banks with paper issues may be quite sound or rich, and

yet unable to exchange gold for their own paper notes, simply because the gold is absorbed in property or trade, while the paper is doing duty for it as a medium.

The great requisite in issues of paper money is guarantees in rich companies—shareholders of great wealth. Discretion in its use is absolutely necessary ; the laws which have put limits to its production help to moderate what over-ambition might seek to execute. Paper, and nothing but paper, is never thought of, except on some extraordinary conditions, such as the State holding the whole land, which some men expound. The history of the assignats of the first French revolution is well known, but no one can take this case unconditionally, because the French were in extraordinary circumstances, and madly interfered with by other nations. When we hold paper, whether of an individual, a company, or a nation, we have only other people's promise to pay on demand or as agreed ; when we hold gold we possess intrinsic value so long as society exists as at present. Of 'course the value of gold may or may not be equal to iron in a normal or unartificial state of society ; it would be then used independent of an unnecessary circulating medium, that would determine their real value, for value would be reversed by being the more valued or in demand the less labour in their production.

Having said this much on money, we may endeavour to understand present society's constitution by taking up a few of its chief characteristics, limiting ourselves to the following :—1st. The present mode of the distribution of property ; 2nd. Law and Government ; 3rd. Competition ;

4th. Machinery ; and 5th. General effects of the property principle in society.

1st. The present mode of the distribution of property. The original distribution of property, particularly that hen who always laid the golden eggs—land—we need not enter into; it would be equally foreign to our intention, and barren in producing an understanding of the present distribution of property. But, before leaving it, we may ask, if it be natural that the earth should be in possession of a few—a class? Is it right in our conscience that this should be so? Men need not wait on nature to undo human usurpation and practical blundering? The effects in present society shew the blundering ; and it is clearly man's duty to harmonize his practice with nature, for if men's assertion and practical action in truth do not follow what is right, we may remain hopeless of right's ultimate triumph, for assuredly nothing else will. So we must take heart, think and act for ourselves.

The distribution of property is in reference to the means by which we live in our greater or less share of human necessities and luxuries. Were it possible, a line might be drawn between permanent and transitory property ; but the one class runs by degrees so into the other as to make the idea more and more confused. If you take your dinner from the table, and double or triple its weight of tar, mix them together till all is one colour, then tell us the portions thereof which are wholesome and nutritious? This is a sad task, is it not? Labour, perhaps the most noble occupation of our life—meaning common, useful, and intelligent labour—is besmeared to

such a degree that it has but little favour in our eyes. It is very different with permanent productive property ; it makes our hearts happy only to think of it, for in it we see not only a source of luxurious living to the possessor, but the more important one of its dissipation, supporting very large if not the entire number of people. This amounts to God-instituted labour—a curse, and man-instituted property—a blessing. In feudal times, it was easily seen, the barons or landed proprietors were the sole support of the whole ; through them they directly or indirectly were dependent for work, such as it was, and consequently sustenance. A little foreign commerce would not alter the fact, only give it a broader foundation ; and the difference now is very great, but the principle and relationship are the very same. It is interest of capital and the rent of land, of those who have the fortune to possess them, which supports the general livelihood of the whole nation. The richer a nation is in capital and rich land, and citizen individuals deriving annual payments of interest or rent from India, Australia, Canada, as well as at home, gives an additional compliment to support in better condition, or in greater numbers, the whole people. What of this income that is not expended annually, and not re-spent till it is absolutely used up, is accumulated and the nation in proportion the richer. When part of this annual income, or part of the accumulations of past years, is spent on something of productive power, such as machinery, houses, &c., the nation is permanently benefited by it, while the nation enjoys the prosperity occasioned by the expenditure of the money. Had it been

expended on ordinary living and perishable necessities and luxuries by both the first and secondary holders, it would have disappeared never to rise again. Let working men who would be reformers think of this—the money spent on tobacco, spirits, &c., of a perishable nature, is gone for ever ; but money spent in furniture, cottages, &c., exists for years to serve ourselves or others. By all means let life have the necessities and comforts of life ; but duty requires all to squander nothing.

Let the two distinct kinds of income be kept in view, the direct from capital and rent, and the indirect depending entirely upon the former by rendering all service and the production of all commodities for both classes. By this means the possessors of incomes from interest and rent find the necessities and luxuries of life in exchange for those incomes, which again are spent and respent by the classes who have them indirectly. The direct, or interest and rent, is the common vital principle by which society lives and moves—that supports the whole people in work, in the first place, and sustenance, as it is, as an exchange for their work. The people are thus the instrument and the performers, while the privileged orders are the parties for whom the former exist : if they exist not for that special purpose, they can have no mission or right on earth ; at any rate, they must participate in the favours flowing from that class, and if so, how can they without some labour in return ? And what becomes of the interest and rent when passing through the hands of the working orders ? It differs not from the first spending, which is in small portions in some articles and larger portions in

others, absorbed in every exchange by interest and rent. Were it not so, it would be in continual motion without any particular circuit; it is annually entirely absorbed to be again used for the same purpose. As was stated before, when the income, whether of a first or secondary order, was as largely as possible spent in articles of comparative permanency, the nation was quite as prosperous at the time, and was actually much richer at the end of the year. It is this which gives us power to support an increase of inhabitants; on the other hand, when population increases beyond the power of the interest and rent to support, which any bad harvest might bring about, other conditions being of an average kind, the result is well known in the conditions of life becoming so unfavourable as to check population. How much unheard of misery is implied in this state of things?—but, of course, it only affects those who are almost or entirely without any resources from interest or rent. Interest and rent go much farther in the support of people than at first would be conceived. People do not all require so much money to support them as is found necessary for criminals. Our national income is over L.70,000,000 per annum; taking this sum, how many would it support at L.14 each? It would support five millions of inhabitants, which is about a sixth of the whole inhabitants of Britain. And this sum only represents a fraction of the whole sum of interest and rent. The small holders of interest and rent who can just find a humble living from that source, nevertheless, support many in some small part of their pickings for sustenance.

Those extraordinary times of public prosperity, when the hard workers are fully employed, and probably with somewhat higher remuneration, owe their existence to large amounts of accumulated property or forestalling accumulations, which are exchanged for machinery, houses, ships—such as that memorable time of railway constructing, some fourteen years ago. The money may be retained for a longer or shorter period in the hands of the manual working class, but times ultimately change, and leave that class, as a class, where they were—living from hand to mouth. The wise, when circumstances admit, leave this pitiful state at some distance ; but even with them the fluctuations of wealth are very great if they live as most people have to do, engaging in considerable speculations, and dependence on the honesty of others. It has been said, labour was paid with little remuneration in proportion to the utility of the employment. Thus the arduous duties of a British minister finds his annual salary to be in thousands of pounds, while the agricultural labourer finds it easily counted in single pounds. Present society makes both employments necessary ; and there are those who think it requires no nice discrimination to distinguish which is unquestionably of the greatest utility. It is a most distressful affair for both extremes in wealth and influence to be thus mixed up into one class—servants, for assuredly, in the best offices for well paid clerkships is not to be found one who would view this alliance with disdain ; but another, from the manual workers, could be got to beg its dissolution with pride. Yet this alliance exists, because the system of society makes the one equally

with the other necessary, and while that is the fact they must be equally honourable. Perhaps some knowing one would suggest that the one class were 'brain' and the other 'muscle' workers. Allowing this one particle of truth, ought not the latter, which has the greater tear and wear, to command the greater share of life's necessary supplies? Education must command superior wealth—why so? If the children of the poor go to work by necessity for a livelihood, and the children of the rich to school till almost manhood, the result is obvious; but the question will present itself—Why not all children have equal rights to a good education? Besides, a forced education, which is quite common, is an imposition on society and on the individual: the fact is, education to any extreme degree ought to be its own reward, the same as all great proficiency in the arts and sciences not immediately connected with daily or necessary labour. But all art and science is made necessary labour in present society! and consequently they must just go on reaping the greater reward, that is, to those families who can afford to give education to command it. Still this does not invalidate the natural truth that men ought to have the means of living equally within their reach; it would only partially mitigate the evil of poverty did they all have a liberal salary. Some trades strive to have equal wages among themselves; might they not extend the proposition to other trades and situations, all who assisted in doing society's work?

We are all of one race, having one stomach each; an hour to the one is neither more nor less to the other, and

a hundred other things and wants sufficiently identical to warrant equal remuneration. There can be no absolute justice in regard to work and the enjoyment of the products. It is our duty and privilege to mutually assist and be assisted by each other ; the party who assists or 'gives' having the 'better' position of the two. And those trades have not got the credit which they were entitled to for endeavouring to equalise wages, for it is not the indifferent workmen who want this arrangement ; we understand they are uniformly the best workmen and best members of their class. Even with equal remuneration, a single man has a superior position for saving or for selfishness than a man with a family ; in this each man has his period of bachelorhood at his command, and society leaves us the responsibility of our own actions in regard to marriage. However, it is not easy to avoid looking at the various class workers in society, that, naturally, the necessary labour for the sustenance of human beings in the comforts of life is quite distinct from many of the clerkship occupations. The direct utility of the former gives it a preference over the latter, which is of questionable utility ; and while we would, in a general statement, assert physical labour to be the essential condition for the erection of all valuable works, it would be superfluous to particularise when we are all surrounded by them. Physical labour is thus not for ephemeral existence, but also for the daily useful works of art which may last for centuries, and all the works of the ornamental and monumental, all the arts which crown human labour with pure and true glory—although some

of the latter works might be left for pastime employment, were that pastime allowed—are solely its production. Those above participating in these labours—the idle drones who would extract pleasure from all, and trouble themselves to give pleasure to none—woefully deceive themselves in their selfishness. Active employment in the physical has its pleasures as well as active mental work, and the one gives a zest in the appreciation of the other. But in regard to the distribution of property in society, physical labour is very subordinate in its influence and value. The money they acquire goes through them like a filter; of necessity, they reflect a borrowed light, but inherent power to make times of plenty they have none. When manual labour is tied down to the necessities of life, how can it build and furnish a mansion to live in and encourage industry? When life's sustenance is barely at its command, how can it command museums and botanical gardens on a small scale? Those who receive rents of houses and lands, interest of moneys, &c., may have all these and more, but the poor slave who has simply his own person to sell and profit by cannot but use his weekly wage with celerity.

Necessity is the mother of that fact, and hence extra expenditure of the rich among the poor for labour is not kept by the labourer, but goes on being spent again and re-spent; each transaction bringing it out of the hands of the inferior orders into the constitutional reservoir, the whole must come to supply the superior orders with their annual interest and rent. These poor labour, but not for themselves; they are bought with a price, or they

labour for a livelihood, and the produce of their labour is for those who can sustain labour. Is this not a hopeless servitude? And although labour is the first necessity of all wealth, it does not retain the wealth it produces, but has only sustenance from the work, the permanent effects passing to those who are already possessors of interest or rent, extending their influence and power, and encouraging labour only by its annual expenditure.

In illustration of the foregoing mode of distributing property, and its influence in society, take that extraordinary crisis in Australia when wages in certain trades were 25s per day; the sailors, in being engaged, thought of requiring the character of the captain from his last crew—and the great change which has come about now, when we hear much of real distress and want of employment. Australia was prospering as well as any colony could be expected previous to the discovery, or rather general knowledge, that gold was to be had there in profitable quantity and of the purest description. With it as a stimulus, emigration set agoing of no common kind, and with a prosperity which has never been equalled. Between 1853 and 1858 the progress made, either in the old or new world, in wealth and importance, was never before seen. What was the cause of this extraordinary run of great wages, great profits, and great rents? Mr G. T. Train, Chairman of the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce, says:—‘L.34,000,000 sterling of property you (British) sent us in two years, for a population of less than 250,000.’ But now the picture has been considerably changed; and Mr Clan, of Glasgow, said in

1857—‘ We are receiving L.20,000,000 sterling in gold annually from that colony.’ We give it for what it may be thought worth in the judgment of those who take an interest in the question, that the following was the cause of Australia’s great prosperity :—The great amount of money for public expenditure on Government works ; the great amount of money sent out from us on personal and property security, and in establishments of banking and other companies ; and the great amount, although perhaps less than the others, of gold taken out with parties emigrating on their own account—the great wealth was flowing in and being spent, to the extraordinary prosperity of the country. Now the conditions are greatly altered, although they may stand, comparatively speaking, very much better than what is experienced in Britain. The actual want of labour—perhaps the more felt since they had such a large demand and wage in the past—involves the usual attending circumstance, want of the wherewithal to live. The extraordinary expenditure is now withdrawn, and the colony is left to its own resources, which are very great. Not only so, but money expended must yield its interest, and property held in British hands must return its rent ; this interest and rent drain must now be a great drawback to the annual expenditure. Also, working men have been on the increase, machinery and improvements have been established, all tending in one direction, and apparently given one of the most promising countries in the world an almost chronic complaint of superabundant labour.

Ireland is another illustration of a negative kind that

the expenditure of money from first sources is the main cause of prosperity. Absenteeism was for years, almost centuries, a well-known cause of poverty and wretchedness. It has been like a bone with some flesh on it which was the subject contested for by a succession of bull-dogs ; of course there was legality or might, although there might be a want of right.

Scotland has had less to complain of, and perhaps taken better policy in unwearied industry, and consequently conquered the drain England has made on her by the attraction of the metropolis of the world. We acknowledge there are those who hold absenteeism has not had effects ; the money comes back again more or less indirectly in the extra demand created where the absentees expend their income, say they ; but this gives the favoured centres and surrounding country the lion's share, and, if the lion cannot digest the whole, the remains will be enjoyed by any other county or country. The Western Isles of Scotland or Hebrides is an excellent example, from its being on a small scale and thoroughly well carried out, to the deprivation of the patient natives. The people, naturally industrious, contented, and attached to the islands, have been kept, by the peculiar circumstances, deplorably ignorant, and poor to the verge of starvation, all to export the little good produce reaped on the islands in exchange for money to pay rents. Yet the general view taken of the distribution of property in society is as if manufacturers were the first source, and the continual benefactors ; they are mere machines, the same as the employed, to supply the wants of those who live without

labour. When it is otherwise, the truth will have made us free. What of life that is enjoyed among manual workers is from a higher source than any institution in society—taking exception to a comparative view with other nations. Trade can never stand still till monied men demand and get their money to secrete in the earth, and proprietors of land and houses require and get them to lie idle but for their own use. But so long as the representatives of interest and rent prefer enjoying their incomes—and the more and richer they be the better for the poor—so long will the working bees be duly inquired after to labour and receive remuneration.

As we have seen, the never-failing demand is from interest and rent. Second-hand incomes find the great proportion of them spent for sustenance the time the service is rendered on which they depend, being again circulated, and every exchange sending so much to interest and rent, and a smaller sum to be re-spent, till absolutely absorbed. The writer of 'Commentaries on Ireland' tells us—'The origin of trade is corporeal necessity; the want of food, habitation, and apparel.' This is true enough in a natural sense, and, of course, in present society it has important influence throughout the whole. But the same writer admits the Irish to be sadly in want of these 'corporeal necessities,' and the contra proposition, the great want of trade. Who ever heard of poor persons with empty purses being 'the origin of trade?' no matter how great 'the want of food, habitation, and apparel.' If money is subscribed to supply these necessities, here is the fact, says an impulsive

'apparel' dealer. No; the want was the cause of the charity, and the money from the grand resources of property was the cause of the trade. Suppose the Irish absentees had twenty millions annually, and this sum was spent in, instead of out of, Ireland, there might be four pounds for every inhabitant, and for families of ten forty pounds annually; the people would, as a matter of course, enrich themselves by it in many ways, even rise in the scale of rational beings. The Irish have suffered, according to Mrs Hall, from a conceited prejudice against labour—labour unbecoming a man, and that man a poor one with a family! But who are free of prejudice? If rent is an aristocratic power, interest has had its rise as a democratic power; and the latter has fairly out-matched the former. Lands and houses are largely mortgaged; they are ostensibly rent, but the principal part goes for interest. Our national debt gives upwards of twenty-five millions interest; and all trade is carried on by a floating capital which is expected to give extra interest. And we are not now living on home produce, yet other articles give little to rent, more to interest, and most to labour. It is this that makes interest and rent go so far in what is called our 'civilisation.' Were we to form in our mind the most perfect state society could arrive at in the present system, it would be that where many of its members were retired from business on an independence, and that number as many as would keep the labour market good, and where the hours of labour were so few as to allow ample time for life's enjoyment when in full employment. But we no sooner form such

an idea than in rush opposing ideas from the condition of things. Over-population, from the good conditions of life, would render the labour market indifferent, foreign trade at a stand, for exchanges would not be made at the prices the short-hour system made necessary; the other nations would find the markets wholly shut from the competitive test of price—or might we hope to enlist other nations to our short-hour system. People cannot be forced nor expected, in many circumstances where a larger income is necessary, to refrain from working the utmost time possible, although in a general sense it would be desirable; and are the people sufficiently cultivated to use many leisure hours daily without getting into extravagances, especially with the cold sympathies of individualism, and the unnatural power it gives all, ever ready for evil or for good in the pocket? If these and such as these make hope in a tolerable enjoyment of life in the present system disappear, there is no alternative but searching for a system more consistent with life; and every man and woman ought to endeavour to form a true judgment or opinion of the great and important social question of the day, for every person is certainly subject to be materially influenced by the kind of constitution of society existing.

The fact of society being limited in the necessities and comforts of life by the amount of interest and rent is unsatisfactory and must be amended. How much misery and starvation is the consequence of this single phase—limitation? Had we the liberty, that is, the practical conditions at our command, to produce wealth

in proportion to our necessities and comforts, we might be partly pleased by knowing all had a sufficiency of these. But even then the fraternity which must come, the charity which is life's grandest embellishment—they are not here ; an assurance of the morals, sentiments, and intellect of the people being developed and elevated is an essential of any radical and beneficial change. Who can doubt we toil and struggle with the iron grasp encircling the social body ?—who can doubt that legislative power and united philanthropy are unable to cope with the corrupting principle of selfishness and the weight of poverty ? This is where the dead weight is found resting on humanity. Every person knows or may know the beautiful and beneficent theory of the alternate falling of water in the shape of rain, dew, &c., and its continual evaporation from the earth, especially that of the water surface ; how it supports vegetable and animal life, with the support of the sun's vivifying influence ; how man sows, reaps, and consumes under the blessed harmony of nature—the circle is complete and all-sufficient as well as all-favourable for man. But it is not so well known that the distribution of wealth goes through a circular theory of quite as tangible a nature, but very far from being all-sufficient and all-favourable. The evaporation of wealth is continual—to interest and rent ; the rain and dew we have without money and price, but the simple necessities of wealth are only vouchsafed to us by—slavery ; but still we acknowledge from this interest and rent we do receive these vivifying necessities of life.

CHAPTER IV.

DISTRIBUTION OF PROPERTY.

Who could believe for one moment such artificial institutions were from heaven? Who could not see the heavenly origin of sowing, reaping, and consuming? But introduce an artificial principle between nature and humanity, and the scene is changed. God's gifts are now man's gifts—from interest and rent. But, enough.

As a source of wealth in no way connected with ordinary industry for wages or artificial stimulus, there is a natural one, although somewhat limited, capable of universal adoption. This source of wealth is in serving and acting to the best advantage under whatever peculiar circumstances we may be placed; by mutual enjoyments from virtuous habits and companionship, wise, prudent, and social behaviour. Dishonourable gains, whether by unpaid debts or sources discreditable and unjust, of course are held in disdain: the people are always honest by nature in the aggregate, and such gains have been the subject of reprobation by every nation of the globe. Conventional ideas of rights have fluctuated very much, but a truthful and honest spirit was always estimable and honourable; on the other hand, miserly savings, where circumstances do not particularly call for them, are com-

monly viewed in no better spirit than they deserve. They believe in the god Mammon, and purchase life's joys by accumulation ; the habit might almost lead people to doubt their sanity.

The mind must be large enough to keep wealth or property in its subordinate place, and recognise the race of man in a fraternal spirit. Surrounded, as people generally are, by poverty, which may well make them look with suspicion on their own savings, there is a necessity to be assured, with a due sympathy and support to cases peculiarly demanding them, the trifling wages received ; nay, the richest person in the land could never altogether alleviate the evils of poverty. To illustrate this source of wealth, not only in every one's power, but which it is every one's duty to practise, we shall suppose two workmen with equal wages, equal families to maintain, and, to outward appearance, in every way with equal facilities for the enjoyment of life. The head of the one family is generally, in leisure hours, in the midst of his family, amusing, instructing, encouraging mutual good feeling, and not above assisting in a little boisterous fun and mirth on proper occasions. His wife, happy to find her endeavours to render things comfortable appreciated by a kind word, if possible, doubles her efforts ; the good-nature and intelligence which characterise the husband never fails in being infused into the whole family. To please him her ladyship is zealous ; mutual desires to serve each other make this lowly home necessarily one of the happiest in the land. The wages are carefully managed, and found on ordinary occasions rather more than absolutely requi-

site ; and the small savings are husbanded with the hope the parents may not require them, but that the children may be benefited.

In the other family, its head is fond of some enjoyment, like all human nature, but he has a notion it is a thing purchased. He is good company, and knows good company, but has not patience and capability to be steadily the first in the endeavour to create it. He and his wife have often quarrelled, and not unfrequently looked over mutual bitter words ; but the plant of charity, bearing and forbearing, much less determined generosity, never had a healthy start, while the disrespectful or unloving feelings become too common. The wife having no pleasure nor object in her household work, it soon appears anything but creditable ; then the husband enters his home as he might a jail or hospital—for as short time as possible. His wages are dissipated weekly, with no satisfactory happiness to himself or family. The former family used prudently the gifts at their command and reaped the reward ; the latter abused or could not command the good conditions apparently, though not in reality, at their service. How many keep themselves voluntarily cribbed up in close houses, who are killing themselves for want of exercise in the open pure air, which is comparatively illimitable and at the service of all in common ?

A young woman in a certain position in society gets married, and a servant to do her domestic labours ; the place in the house she assumes is gaffer or mistress. One overseer and one overseen ! If she did her own work, as

most newly married wives do, she would or might be better served, wealthier, healthier, and happier ; but as it is, the burden of keeping a servant is just so much dead weight on the establishment—which is all well enough, as the world goes, if the means are permanent and sufficient, but otherwise a dangerous commencement in a new state of peculiar responsibility. More than pointing out any given line of conduct, we would rather show, if possible, that the power that comes within our reach can be used or abused, can be made to supply our necessities only, or with comforts too, by wise and prudent conduct in the expending of income, and the acceptance of all possible natural blessings—without property value, yet of utmost natural value.

An erroneous notion is common, that men are better members for society who expend their whole income, saving no money or wealth. They encourage trade to the utmost ! Yes, they encourage trade where they spend their money. The fact is, did they save money, what good might they not hope to effect ? Money or property is a vital and tangible power, daily experienced. Even were there little generosity in the party—no hope to assist some friend, no probability of pecuniary duties for infirm parents, no sisters in positions of inability to command the comforts of life—he may yet save and actually be a better member of society than if he spent his whole income in passing existence. The money may be spent on questionable characters, or exchanged for suppers, parties, &c. ; but would it be less useful in the bank, lent out to commercial men who could not do without it ? and

in due course, in its accumulation, it might be usefully spent in building houses—one to reside in and the rest to let, the party retiring on these rents. He leaves his situation to be filled up—one good for labour; the employment of masons, carpenters, plumbers, and they in their turn all other trades—second good arising for labour; the annual expenditure of rent in his living—third good quality for labour; he is a payer of poor-rates and other taxes, instead of possibly being a recipient—fourth good from saving at the proper time, in lightening the burdens of labour.

The other party, who spends his whole income regularly in the opposite balance, is he not like the sucked orange, when he has passed the prime of life and his income on the wane? While society is as at present constituted, we must act accordingly, if not for the best and purest character our nature is susceptible of being made and the most happiness naturally possible, at least for those attainable under present conditions. This will-be-poor class play the game for artificial or human power into the hands of the rich, for wealth or property is still the criterion acknowledged. Yet how hard to save, nay impossible, thousands upon thousands must find it; their circumstances necessitate toil, and more toil, with some forced idleness which is worse still and acutely felt, barely keeping debtors outside the door. Mournful unfortunate!

When Mammon has ceased to reign then attention to the dictates of Mammon will be censurable; but at present it is the height of folly to assume or teach entire repudiation of his reigning Majesty. Workmen ought to com-

mand respect from persons well-to-do, as well as among themselves, by striving at independence by being free of debt, folly, and prejudice, and in some measure self-cultivated, morally, intellectually, and in all possible leisure-time arts. It is easily known who the nobility are, in these elegant acquirements. There can be no compass to guide us in life directly emanating from our present social system; the more, then, is it necessary to consult the natural world—which is God's world; here we find guiding principles, founded upon uniform laws. Expediency is the watchword of present society—minding one's-self and not unfrequently using hypocrisy, trampling on others' interests in the fight of the distribution of property, along with the natural guiding impulses inherent in our nature. The present system of society forces all this, and those who are free of taint may cast the first stone of blame and condemnation.

We will not dismiss the distribution of property by the foregoing general statement of its principle, but add something in illustration of it in particular. It is well known that if a working man, or one of the rich, can make the amount of his expenditure less than that of his income, he adds to his own wealth in the first place, and also the permanent and productive property of society. The highest benefit present society can bestow is that it enables us to live in every comfort without engaging in necessary labour. This, to a sick person, is good indeed, but the healthy are in the long majority, it is to be hoped—to them it is little better than an assurance of more of an article they are abundantly possessed of already, for

with health labour is a necessary blessing. These conventional or artificial motives of action which present society makes predominant are purely evil, for it will not be questioned that the *natural* tendency of all improvements knows no favourites, but are diffusive among the whole race. Yet the *artificial* tendency of all improvements is the same, as all that kind of action is common individual selfishness to reap the ever-flowing wealth.

It is the same in labour as it is in capital and all property—the labourer labours for his hire: we must rise above this, labour from duty, and further still, from higher duty and love, in our leisure time. But the present system is a legitimate descendant of that of the feudal lords, keeping us as dependants, sometimes employed, and always in sustenance. They gradually adopted the plan of bargaining for their land first, and afterwards to command foreign luxuries; gave over keeping idle adherents, retaining only domestic servants. The farmer pays his rent in produce or money, or both, and what surplus he may have is his own, to be used as he pleases; the dismissed adherents are necessitated to seek sustenance by working for wages, and become independent—to accumulate wealth, or to starve, if the work, and consequently wages, happen to fail. This is the labourer's privilege and responsibility. The descendants of the old chiefs use the—rents. How? By purchasing unheard-of luxuries, the produce of the descendants of the turned-off adherents, who have turned their hands to all sorts of artistic mechanics.

Thus we have seen wealth the support now as it was

more directly in past feudal times. Labour may stand for the centrifugal power of society, and property acts as the centripetal or power of attraction ; while the natural would indicate human action as the one power, and the other directly that of beneficent nature. Why should property be a subject of glorification, when it depends on an accident of birth—or labour, necessary drudgery ? These are repugnant to the feelings, and peculiarly depending on the constitution of society. But for the closer view of the distribution of property, we may take a common article of consumption, and find out where the price of the article finds its destination. It will be found rent and interest one portion, and labour under all its aspects the rest, such as profit, commission, per centage, &c. Confining our illustration to as few words as possible, we take the case of a four-pound loaf of bread at sixpence-halfpenny—

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| The Retailer, | . | . | . | . | . | 0½d |
| „ Baker, | . | . | . | . | . | 1d |
| „ Miller, | . | . | . | . | . | 0¼d |
| „ Corn Factor, | . | . | . | . | . | 0¼d |
| „ Farmer, | . | . | . | . | . | 2½d |
| „ Landlord | . | . | . | . | . | 2d |
| | | | | | | <hr/> 6½d |

We view each of these as forming one item in the income of each class of tradesmen ; every item, of course, would be representative of all whom they employ in production, and, consequently, the source from which all personal and domestic expenditure is drawn. It is gained only to be necessarily expended in part, wholly, or fall-

ing back on stock—some accumulation forming a circle in poverty, or losing one's property. Various articles differ in the proportion they yield to rent of land ; indeed, some have no direct yield at all ; but labour all articles must have, and the labourers must be consumers of bread, meat, &c.—the direct produce of land. All the trades' representatives—that is, the retailer, baker, miller, corn factor, and farmer—have various commodities besides the particular one referred to by which they derive their whole income ; but they all require to spend them again from necessity, at least in a general sense, under one principle. One part goes towards rent of premises ; another part to interest of capital invested ; another to labour and power in the work ; another to taxes, repairs, bad debts, accidental expenses. If the premises and money are really the party's own—none of the straw man in him—then the advantage is obvious ; as all property gives advantage, he is to that extent a recipient of the vital influence or power in society. He may make his own labour go as far as possible, which must give its worth to his income ; the taxes, &c., must be raised, and the labour employed must be remunerated. In large businesses where every part has to be paid for, the party living on, and in, credit, generally requires but few years to expose the absolutely rotten state of matters. For appearance, he has to live as if the capital, &c., were all his own ; for an humble style of living would not be favourable to extraordinary confidence and credit, which is absolutely essential to maintain his position. We have just for one moment to

suppose manufacturers, or those we referred to, expending their whole income from necessity in comfortable shelter, clothing, and food, to realise our true position. Then ask ourselves if the life we enjoy—are the cares and troubles not more, are the pleasures and healthy conditions not less, than in nature we ought and have a right to expect?

The landlord's share we have not yet discussed. It differs from the others in having no labour connected, taking exception for the arduous duties of collection. But, in the consideration of this subject, let us be well assured neither envy, nor hatred, nor any unbecoming feeling, prejudices our mind against those who happen to slide into the position of landlords; for it may be credited that those who fill such positions are of similar nature with those who fill the positions of tenants and labourers; and the shifting of the one class for another, were it possible, would be most detrimental to the happiness of both. The retailer, &c., &c., have some amount of labour, and require capital and other products of labour to carry on their business, and which justifies whatever amount they respectively receive as their share of the price of the loaf; but the landowner—supposing it hereditary from times of feudal arbitrary possession by the sword, in honour or dishonour—what claim can he establish to justify so large a share, or any share, of the price of the four pound loaf? The farmer's house and other buildings—well, these are something, but very fractional in the whole rent. And it is well known that, at the expiration of a lease, farms generally bring much

larger rents from the improved condition the farm has been put in by the leaving farmer on his own account, but permanently to the benefit of the proprietor, the succeeding farmer further improving to the same effect ; and all along the twopence per loaf is secure as a constitutional tax, which renders no service in exchange.

Is the ground we tread not direct from Almighty God, or sacred in the ever-existent existence ? Then, why should it be lorded over by ephemeral productions, existing to-day, and to-morrow no more ? This is too slender for long acquiescence, and too self-evidently false for long gullibility. Just as well tax the sun's rays, or heaven's distillations, as the ground which produces the necessities of life. Is the one less direct from superior existence than the other ? No ; then the right must or must not exist equally in either. And who would dare affirm the propriety of a twopence per day tax on every family in the kingdom for the sun's heat and light ? That right by constituted society is no less contrary to nature, or rather interposing nature's beneficence, than inimical to human happiness. Wealth or property, the product of labour—such as houses, gold, machines, ships—are different. If property had any foundation, nothing could be clearer than usury for them to be perfectly right ; but it is not natural—it is not right, for those to belong to a class, for the class who have no property has still as much of life's necessities to procure for sustenance as the more fortunate class. So this poor class finds the rent of a house, or the interest of capital, to press equally upon them with the landlord's share of the loaf. They

toil, and toil, and are still poor. Do they expect to become rich by humble drudgery? Who ever did? They are the producers of all wealth, and masters of none. This is a curious and melancholy, yet necessary effect, quite easy to be understood.

Until we can live from our own resources, and labour in production of our own stock in co-operation of some kind, there can be no real freedom. Can freedom be without this or in an ignoble condition? Behold the serf on this hand, and on the other the sovereign lord—the slave, the slaveholder—the employed, the employers. This is not freedom, even although they may produce enough, and to spare, for all. It has the stamp of evil on its forehead; it is the effect of error, and has none of God's countenance—none of nature's truth, which renders us free indeed. The tradespeople's share of the price of the loaf is unobjectionable while the constitution of society remains; but the landlords' share wears no analogy. Their claim would indicate a descent from the heathen gods, and they admitted to be the sovereign possessors, with power to make the earth heritable to one class, and on the poor class impose duties, duties, duties, but no rights which can be resisted. Who will believe that class superior beings? Who will deny they are only human nature, and privileged drones, or, worse still, very great barriers to human happiness? If any idea is true, this certainly is one, that the twopence in the sixpence-halfpenny loaf is a genuine usurpation tax.

We all occupy false positions, from the labourer to the

landlord. But no pounds, shillings, and pence statement can at all disclose the human misery induced by the practical working of the system of property, and in which the usurpation of the land by individuals is conspicuously the most gross. The system is, without doubt, the great primary evil, and which is accountable for the present distribution of property; hence we all are victimised, and have a perfect right to discuss and do with it what appears best. It makes *work* and *food* depend on external conditions of a purely accidental kind. We may or may not be provided with food, clothing, and shelter. Absolute certainty of these, and nothing less, is in accordance with the distribution of property which ought to exist. And, on the other hand, we are able and willing to work, but we may or may not have work to perform. Here, also, absolute certainty is requisite for every person able and willing. Dividing the earth or the world's wealth equally among all is preposterous nonsense; union in division of labour has perfectly scattered to the winds all idea of dividing in individualism; hence the system is viewed as the monster evil, the appropriation of the land as property but secondary. The usurpation is unjust, but the class cannot be expected to be removed otherwise than by the downfall of the primary evil—the system.

We might again divide the price of the loaf between labour on the one hand, and rent and interest on the other, since the latter is little better than an imposition to those who have no wealth; for has not the whole people an equal claim to the wealth of those who have

preceded them? Did it descend to us and from us with any approximation to equality, or in common, the rent and interest share would entirely disappear by the whole people being benefited. But we will simply state that the larger half of the price of the loaf may be stated to be that of labour, although there might be very little difference. Yet, since labour itself is absorbed by interest and rent, having no vitality of its own, but depending entirely on them, or mixed up with them in the same person, the further analysis of this phasis of society may be unnecessary. The system of society makes labour an instrument for its purposes—not a part of itself. In concluding the distribution of property, we would be reminded, whether we like philosophy or not, philosophy overrules all classes in society—by necessity. We cannot but do what we are caused to do; and we cannot do what no causes have not made to come about. We cannot become a Greek scholar by will—no, we could not even make a hair grow on our body where it does not and will not grow, nor have a cultivated and gentle mind by will.

What we are, we are by necessity. We are limited in power and action to cause and effect, and cause and effect is necessity. The best and wealthiest in the land are under this necessity—they are what they are from it; and so are professional thieves and prostitutes. Natural and artificial causes necessitate them; what is unsightly and degraded must be removed by the causes being changed. So, no class can reasonably assume superiority or inferiority in regard to another; but indivi-

dual conduct has a duty connected, to aspire to what is noble, good, and pure; and this ought to be the object of all public and private education, as it is the most important feature of life, insuring happiness to the individual and all connected.

If the innate inclinations and external conditions are favourable for the cultivation of the intellectual and moral duties, the result will be in the extreme limits of comparative virtuous character; but if the conditions are reversed—and these natural and artificial conditions are almost beyond individual influence—what will be the result? The other extreme of character, unfavourably viewed by all, even those who exemplify it. These extremes, and all between them, are the results of necessity, cause, and effect; so, to be rational, people of every class must command our sympathy and love—varying in degree, it will be from that of the highest character and friendship to that felt for the known victims of error and falsehood.

We do not insult people's free opinion by saying to love all alike, or love most the most degraded; but we are in duty bound to assist those most who are most in need of assistance. Our duty will be done for them even should it be heavy; yet our keenest sympathy and love must remain with those who have earned it by traits of character known to be good, true, pure, and innocent. The share one possesses of property is liable to similar uncontrollable circumstances with character, and equally the effect of necessity. And innate good sentiments often lead to poverty, and poverty, in time, with its accom-

panying tyranny, misery, and temptations, to any given excess or crime. Our birthright of character cannot be usurped, although it may be frustrated; but our birthright of property is successfully usurped, and we are as innocent of the fact as some poor hen which has been producing eggs for a long time, yet finds her nest as poverty-stricken as it was before she began. Yet the people are acquiring the greatest share of the property of the nation very fast—yes, faster than the favourites of fortune are admitted to rank among the ‘privileged class.’ But, above all, do not neglect the hard fate of the honest poor in the estimation formed of the distribution of property; the newspapers give us daily accounts of continued heartrending wretchedness.

A paper before us, giving illustrations of ‘A Merry Christmas’—the Illustrated Weekly News—supplies a case of the murder of a child by its mother. The mother, Mary Ann Hamilton, gives herself up to a policeman for the act. He asked her why she did it, and she said ‘I could not see it want for food any longer.’ On being cautioned, and charged with it, she replied, ‘I am sorry; it’s too true,’ and commenced crying. She seems to have had some consolation in a speedy death. And it is remarked, the place where the prisoner lodged presented a scene of the most abject poverty and wretchedness; and it was stated that her husband, who is a tailor, had no work, and that they had been receiving parish relief for some time. Where is the good and true of a system that could admit of a distribution of the necessities of life when cases like this are of daily occurrence? Ah! ex-

pect wheat from tares!—good to come out of that which is false! Take care of self-deception. Even in the fourteenth century there were laws against usury, which is ‘interest,’ and this interest now probably gives more vital health to society than the land itself. If such revolutions in opinions are effected, what may not be expected?

CHAPTER V.

GOVERNMENT AND LAWS.

THESE, as they generally exist, are simply creations of society. Government is principally in the executive or mastership of the collection and distribution of the nation's revenue and expenditure—the conducting of national business on the one hand, and the advisers of the nation and monarch on the other. Human society will probably never be able to do without rulers, but they may be engaged in such totally different conditions and work as would prevent any analogy between them. They who form the Government are for the present invested with national duties, and responsibility in their performance ; this is properly *the Government*.

However, many persons associate the national representatives as a body with them. No doubt they may have a direct influence on Government ; besides, the Government is expected to find many, or all its members, out of that body, according to the institutions of different nations. All this is so well known, we need not enter on any details. Laws are emanations of Governments, and partake of human error, and sometimes worse, when that of human passion, and prejudice, and hatred is cognisable. Law ! The term seems pure caricature of natural law. Many people deceive themselves with the idea that natural

law is insufficient, neither is it in our natural conditions, the same as opium-eaters and spirit-drinkers conceive common natural fare insufficient—and it is insufficient for them. Just necessary evil, say the many, never doubting but that one particle of truth renders the whole dose good and for the best. But we have the term law in far humbler connections—we have mill and factory laws, mechanical and retail laws, club laws, and—excuse us for or for not mentioning—Lynch law. Take a comparison between club and Government laws, to find which has the best right of existence. Government laws are sometimes only the will of the Emperor, the King, or their councillors. Modern improvements have given the people the right to hold up their right hand, and a choice few of some peculiar position a vote to choose this one or that one, who can live and devote his time without payment to counsel and deliberate in law-making. The fortunate one sits and votes in Parliament, the routine business in the disbursements of money, &c. ; and if by chance a bill or two of any importance to the nation is forced into discussion, he may have a shadow of a chance to engage the attention of the House, but with a sure power to give his vote, but by that time for a purpose in reality generally of very little consequence. Yet it has the name of being the very best club—we take it to be in its private more than its public life. It would take a stout heart to attack a really bad old law ; they are sacred, although not to be defended. Club laws you can face, and understand as genuine rules ; nay, you must subscribe to them. To be under them which are so attested seems far in ad-

vance of the other, which neither you nor your representative ever had your eyes on. But they must both exist for the benefit of those under them, or in the one case they act the part of oppression and tyranny, and in the other they can be avoided altogether.

Government laws, in the most favourable view, have two immediate objects—the protection of our person, and second, the upholding of individual property possessions. The right, or justice, or benefit derived from this can never be taken as equal justice to all, because personal wrong may be endured from want of means to insure its triumph ; and it is an insult to all not born with a silver spoon in their mouths to tell them their property is guarded by statute law. Besides, being born and bred with this property constitution and these statute laws over our heads, natural rights in property are superseded. We have right emanating from this constitution, instead of from the one pure source—State sanction, not the divine, the true. And since all this has received the sanction of a few generations, and is still in practice, there is nothing for it but to support it, even against our conviction, until another or the true constitution of society is so universally acknowledged as to peacefully and permanently occupy its place. Laws, or State regulations, in regard to the people, are almost exclusively engaged with the abuses arising out of the above system of property ; purely personal affairs, having no regard to property, are comparatively insignificant. The rarity of personal aggression, in comparison to that on property, makes this the fact, and it speaks strongly for the moral nature of humanity,

while it points out the irritating sore in social life. Those who make a trade of thieving have not the slightest ill-feeling to those they would deprive of some property ; their whole motive of action being enveloped and developed with the peculiar influence of the property principle. But by the innate love of justice in our nature, the system has acquired some approximation to just laws ; the order and security enjoyed is in a great measure the effect of these laws.

Trade of every description requires order and security in the State. Without the power exerted through the laws, under present conditions, the vicious and indolent would possibly cease all industrial occupation, and not only live on the more honest and honourable, but, as has been so often witnessed before, take the best of everything, and have very little regard to the preservation of the remainder. Common education cannot counteract the degrading tendencies of private property ; hence we see often among the professions, education such as it is, exerted to dupe and rob on an immense scale. No one will deny that benefits are derived from education, especially when it includes the exemplary and industrial ; but its power can scarcely at all mitigate the evils throughout the whole of our social life, in our every day experience, and from the present instituted system of society. Education, in its proper and universal meaning, can accomplish all within the limit of possibility ; yet, with the one condition unchanged—namely, society as at present established—education must be defective, if not pernicious, because its influence has a power permanent

and vital, whereas defective education is transient, and consequently artificial. The good is liable to be nullified and overthrown by continual contact with the vitiated, followed by a more or less degraded course according to the external conditions and inherent power for prudence and virtue. The path of every person in civilisation is near and parallel to a precipice; the laws would tend to save us from danger, but will never conduct us into a safe and natural path. To citizens of great prudence and honesty laws are little known, and possess less interest; circumstances may occur which force even some of that class to act in accordance with them—in that case the lawyer is in requisition. When the system is understood that private property is to be respected and protected, our innate powers enable us so to shape our course through life that just laws cannot call in question our acts, the precise knowledge of the laws being generally or universally conceived superfluous. Even though this is the case, the necessity of the laws and also their administration is not questioned, nor asserted to be of minor importance. It is quality, and not quantity, that is desirable, and the influence is diffused through the whole State, for good or for evil. The State that can bring a people to enjoy and not abuse the greatest amount of freedom, with confidence in their prudence and moderation, acts best for that people, and for that State or Government, for confidence and trust beget confidence and trust. It is desirable that all men should have some voice in the laws they act under, yet it may be more than questionable whether the majority of voices should have the whole re-

representatives at their disposal. It would probably be much better to have three classes of representatives, to represent society under three classes, with popular election in each case, and to form one representative body. These elected individuals may remain so for one, two, or three years, but are only servants of the nation (why not paid?), existing to-day in honour, and to-morrow are simple citizens. We must have every existing institution developed, if it can be improved, and if not, the necessary change. Our own progress depends on this, and our natural right demands a share of the government. There is innate honour in all, but it is not cultivated. Why prop us up by laws we have no say in making, denying our natural virtues, while undermining them by artificial supports? The evasion of such laws is apt to be a subject of glorification; and those whose virtues are comparatively weak are content to shape their conduct by the law at first, but soon find that lawful punishment is by no means certain when they act with more self-interest than justice. Then follows more vicious policy; but the divine powers of reflection and perception are more than sufficient to render that policy secret, keeping free from taint in the public eye—thus, like all practical error, taking its victim forward by imperceptible degrees to what is further and further from truth and all that is good.

Taking our whole mental nature, each is naturally a law sufficient for himself or herself. If exceptions occur, they properly are assisted by magistrates or justices, who are chosen as such for their well-known ability to govern

themselves, and consequently to assist their less fortunate fellow-beings. But what have we to do with natural truth here? It is Government and Laws that form our text, and what number of persons will agree about either? Is it not narrow majorities, after many years' agitation, that give us one really important and beneficial law? This never-ending division of opinion in these matters shows they are not of the truth, and discreditable to the present age of intelligence and rationality.

Honest men are not rendered such by being regulated by law—it does not make citizens good and happy. Even were tyrannical and unjust laws predominant for a time, and misery general, comparatively good laws may take off this load, but it can do no more. They are like the doctor of modern times, who pretends to do no more than assist nature when labouring in disease. Society is in a state of disease, and no probability of a change to the better; yet health is not only possible, but the normal state both of individuals and society. Artificial causes keep society in a state of irritation and hardships; the mind knows not freedom from care, and what enjoyment is experienced is more from natural causes than artificial. It is no doubt the system that presses so heavily on us; the Government and Laws are secondary. What have we to do with them? We know little more about them than the power exerted to launch out taxes. They have not the intrinsic beauty of science to draw us to a knowledge of them, nor the enchantment of the arts to render us devotees; no power to cultivate to what is noble and true, nor the heart to genuine taste and feeling.

It is all the reverse, and too much like American politics, long before the present disruption, which were said by some of themselves to be like pitch, not to be touched without being defiled. Our mental powers are beautifully in harmony for the great purposes of humanity, developed for guidance in opinion, judgment, feeling, and impulse—all personal, no reference to property.

-- *Mine and thine* is a usurpation ; it is a cloud put there by our own hands, to darken the glorious sun ; it unnecessarily abstracts the intellect from its legitimate work, and gives it labour no less distasteful than miserable. The intellect is the helm to guide us rationally straight through life's ocean, but there are great artificial currents existing of man's creation ; the helm guides still—the beauty of the power is lost and sometimes questioned from the ships being necessarily driven from their proper course by the surrounding superfluous currents.

To take up the subject in detail is unnecessary, since all Government and Law, as at present popular, are simply expediences arising out of the constitution of society, which is property, and has been found false. But this conclusion can never reasonably deter any person from appreciating and strengthening those governments and laws which appear most productive of justice and the general benefit of the governed. This subject may pass with an extract from Locke on Government :—‘ But though the golden age had more virtue, and consequently better governors, as well as less vicious subjects, and there was then no stretching prerogative on the one side to oppress the people, nor consequently on the other any

dispute about privilege to lessen or restrain the power of the magistrate, and so no contest betwixt rulers and people about governors or government, yet, when ambition and luxury in future ages would retain and increase the power without doing the business for which it was given, and, aided by flattery, taught princes to have distinct and separate interests from their people, men found it necessary to examine more carefully the origin and rights of government, and to find out ways to restrain the exorbitance and prevent the abuses of that power, which, having entrusted in another's hands only for their own good, they found was made use of to hurt them. For there are no examples so frequent in history, both sacred and profane, as those of men withdrawing themselves and their obedience from the jurisdiction they were born under, and the family or community they were bred up in, and setting up new governments in other places—whence sprang all that number of petty commonwealths in the beginning of ages, and which always multiplied, as long as there was room enough, till the stronger or more fortunate swallowed up the weaker, and those great ones, again breaking to pieces, dissolved into lesser dominions. It is plain, then, by the practice of governments themselves, as well as the law of right reason, that a child is born a subject of no country or government. He is under his father's tuition and authority till he comes to the age of discretion, and then he is a freeman, at liberty what government he will put himself under, what body politic he will unite himself to.'

CHAPTER VI.

COMPETITION.

THERE is another word frequently used of the same meaning as competition, and for a distinct understanding a distinction must be made—the word is emulation. The latter appears to be the proper word where trade is not concerned. Trade or exchange of property, labour for money or money for goods, is the exclusive sphere of competition. Hence we say, if two or more persons are in the market with their labour or commodities, they compete with each other for business or exchange. There is a permanent competition existing in the common and necessary means used to find ourselves subsistence, whether in labour or exchange of produce. The introduction of money or prizes in acts of simple emulation does not properly form competition, because they exist not of necessity, but are pure stimulants to emulation. Then, how define emulation? It will include all similar action on purpose to excel. It is quite natural in necessary labour, in the hewing of given blocks of stone to particular and similar parts of an architectural design, or in playing a game of draughts or chess—call it for fame, glory, eminence, or money, or some such combination, it matters little if that combative spirit to excel others is not included for our position and interest in society.

Both competition and emulation may be carried to excess. The former has the motive power of want, or fear of want, keeping good our social position, or the making of money; and in the other, display of skill, capacity, energy, physical powers, or other natural and commendable qualities. The love of emulation is strong in youth, in practice is a great source of pleasure, and ought to be taken advantage of for the cultivation of both mental and physical capacities.

We test our powers with some champion of the many departments cultivated—our happiness is supreme if successful, and under common circumstances our own excellence is not underrated; and if positively worsted, we find good consolation in a catalogue of names which come after our own in the list. Competition has none, or next to none, of the attractive attributes of emulation. It is of the number of ‘necessary evils’ necessary to be engaged in, even if we find it a continual bore. The necessity, of course, is entirely dependent on the individual property-constitution of society. We could compete with others could we laugh in our triumph, but human nature has more heart than that. What makes our success and prosperity may be another’s woe and ruin—our life, in a sense, is in one or other of the scales of a balance, and the vibrations are in many cases sickening and disastrous. It is not only over-refined habits and enlightened minds who find competition repulsive, but simple common sense and a delicate self-respect cannot well brook the candidateship for a lucrative any more than a work-and-starve situation. ‘What

cannot now be cured must be endured,' so many people are enabled to set about work enveloped in competition, and find it pretty agreeable as the world goes; but for the most successful you must lower morality to business-honesty, a hypocritical smile with smooth words, and no nice appreciation of honour. Competition is naturally painful in 'seeking work,' 'seeking custom,' 'seeking a situation that has had dozens of applicants before us,' and in being one of a hundred and fifty recommending apartments to let, in answer to an advertisement. Is all this not peculiarly and positively beggarly? Yet there are those who take, and get others to take, up this work with apparent pleasure, making a profession of canvassing orders. Or witness the trades' or merchants' advertisements in any widely-circulated newspaper. Every one would have you try his wares—that is, every one would have you subscribe to his income; and the manoeuvres to secure subscribers are very ingenious, and quite tempting. Cheapness is the grand bait, quality is frequently a better; but people have different faiths even in these, and should a good bargain be given on one occasion, the probability is a double profit may be secured on the next, if the occasion is favourable.

Where is the room for the comfortable, not to use stronger language, feeling of confidence and trust in others? Do such commercial or trading hypocrites know such conduct is subversive of all morality? While the trading classes are subject to grave complaints in regard to morality, it cannot be ascribed to any particular stain on their character more than to any other class, for

what class can pretend to be better than another? A few centuries ago, when trade was very limited, the luxuries and elegancies enjoyed less or more by all of the present were then totally unknown; even an English, much less a scientific education, was the exception even among those who could have commanded something creditable. Science and art were inappreciable, while adventures in robbery or fanaticism were predominant. They were not naturally inferior to us, but the conditions or external circumstances made all the difference in mode of life and mental developement. Rent and interest, the vital principle now, had scarce any footing then; what of rent there was we find principally or totally to be of the produce of the land, supporting the proprietor and family, domestics and adherents. The number and equipment of those adherents gave the great or powerful their station in society. The life of all was extremely rude; physical force and violence or assumed power held the great body of the people in utter subjection, sometimes with mutual good-will and affection. The unscrupulous were ever plotting or attempting the invasion of the possessions of their neighbours; war would rage in consequence, surely more fearful and disastrous than law prosecutions of our day, and still less certain in the ultimate success of the greater right. Revenge was engendered less or more on both sides, and the deadly feud remained for generations. Competition was as yet unknown as we understand it, the strife of man exhibiting itself principally in the physical, the mental being in the keeping and at the command of the clergy.

The Magna Charta of the thirteenth century was a beginning of another spirit, the mental showing itself in advance of the manners and spirit of the age, and the poorer classes being very long indeed before their privileges and serfdom gave way to equality and freedom. The arts of peace have been the grand power in the civilisation of modern society, and the corporations of the small and large towns were the focus of those arts of peace; and with their rise we find simultaneous increasing demands for the luxuries and refinements of life, in place of a barbaric display. This gave that trade a stimulus which was the cradle of competition, although it was as yet monopoly and large profits; but time develops all principles in operation, and the consequence is evident in the great increase of wealth, which is so grand to some parties' ideas as to be designated the glory of a nation. It would, in all probability, not be well without it, yet it cannot be accounted satisfactory if tried by the divine standard of human feeling and aspiration. Parties get possessed of machinery or other productive capital—they cannot remain idle without great loss, and, in applying them, improvements are continually made, to give a greater profit; so they produce, and find it necessary to continue extending their connections to keep the production going on and render the trade more valuable. This is the competition we have realised, and it renders trade next to impossible except with small profits and a large turn-over, as has formerly not been the case in regard to common productions. So far it served a great purpose, in cheapening and extending exchanges to every available

place ; it has had its work as a civiliser, taking a principal part in the 'Arts of Peace.'

But competition is often encumbered with much unnecessary labour, making things dearer than they otherwise might be, not to speak of the grumble at selling at small profits, with an exceptional transaction when it can be had on the side of a large profit. The will is for larger and larger profits of incomes ; competition necessitates moderation, and sometimes actual loss. This tendency is not more true among the employed than the employers, among flunkeys than paid courtiers. The rich dispute hypocritically about who shall have the loaves and fishes, but they are all old enough to agree about the price or value of the prize, thus excluding the economic and saving power of competition. The poor find their employers necessarily assist them to dispute with each other as to who will work most for least remuneration in dull trade. The reverse is remarkably slow in old countries in brisk trade ; hence the low prices of manufactured goods. In buying them the common remark is—How can they be manufactured at the price ? but which might be known to be in a great degree from the merciless power of the screw—that is competition, and this is its peculiar glory ; but some improvement in manufacture or application of machinery may have assisted, which, in the first instance at least, is attended by larger remuneration and not uncommonly more prejudicial to health. We would all take exception to a pressing competition, but for others a nearly useless sympathy is not overflowing, so a bargain has a charm to the great majority ; our in-

terest is here, not in the manufacture. There is no mistake about the peaceful warfare, not only civil, but social. It preys into the heart of society, into the heart of all engaged—this competition does—and cannot be welcomed nor debarred admittance.

We might refer to numerous trading transactions illustrative of competition's waste of labour; but very few must suffice. Butchers in the country are alive to the fact that they may go to a farmer to purchase an ox, but they cannot agree what the price shall be; they meet in the cattle market of some distant town with the animal in question, and there agree. This additional expense involved falls on one of them or both. The public ought, and does, pay for all this, even as they do sometimes have the cheap article from the economising powers of competition. Bakers, grocers, and many other trades, are continually wasting labour by 'driving coals to Newcastle'—sending the largest part of their trade past the doors of other manufacturers of the same article. Farmers in the neighbourhood of country flour mills will send grain to a market town, say eight miles distance, to be sold, and returned to the mill in the neighbourhood where the grain grew. One of the most perfect phases of competition is in contracts, if you get sufficient number, for some specified article. This is the screw put on the contractors, and hence to be applied to the accessories; nothing but the screw ensures the contract, and nothing less will save yourself. Try for a farm, the same principle is predominant, often used with a blush, or perhaps prudence, to ensure a man of money, not straw; he would be

dangerous but for a provision 'that the lowest offer may not be accepted.' The moral effects are a sad feature in the story. The parties themselves who get their position and employment from a hard-driven bargain can scarcely be expected to be favourably disposed to generous conduct towards those employed by them.

Look to the starvation wages of many useful occupations. We would have people perfectly honest, yet without the comforts of life, and in sight of others rolling in luxurious abundance. Ah! many a gem in human nature has lived and died unknown but to a very few. This is really irretrievable loss; these are Heaven's moral light—yes, and intellectual light too—under a bushel. There is less than no compensation in public exposure and punishment of the morally diseased. Competition is a demoralising power of no minor importance. Hate, lies, care, and chagrin are common effects on those who find themselves trying to supplant each other, and that too while leaving their victim without regard or livelihood. One objection would be taken by political economists respecting our ideas of waste of labour, and consequently higher prices than natural. They tell us the principle of present society which makes the less remunerative labour or trade likely to become neglected; the other better remunerated departments of industry are naturally drawing them from the under-paid to the better paid trade—the influence of self-interest. This is, in a minor respect, perfectly correct. In the more important conditions of changing employments there is necessarily an incalculable amount of suffering, and the limits possible to the alleged

fluctuations are extremely narrow ; and, accordingly, we find employments and trades which were but poorly remunerated half a century ago are still the same. And worse, where there is poor remuneration, and a possibility of working overtime, it is sure to be taken advantage of for an increased income—thus cutting our tether, which inevitably must be tied again, and then shorter by the length taken up by the knot.

Working overtime is not justifiable but by necessity. The tone of health is lowered and endangered, and assuredly the profession, trade, or employment is injured. Time does not, and will not, cure this evil ; the conditions of persons and things do and will continue to maintain it so long as there is no radical change. Population not only increases, but there are numbers continually being set free from some department of industry by the improvements and applications of steam-power. There is always a surplus of labourers. Were it a surplus of corn, or any useful commodity, we would rejoice over it with the economist ; but a surplus of labourers must be consuming the necessaries of life—and this we may take for granted, their wants are not supplied out of the morsel savings from the time employed. There is little or no room for us if we do not make room for ourselves. Morality says, Others before self ; Competition says, Self before others, no matter about morality. The social war cease ? Never with individual property. We must strive on, and, if possible, catch the bubble wealth ; the great majority must fail, only able to make a less or more successful resistance to the arch-enemy—want, and ac-

counting it so far good if our honour has not greatly suffered in the attempt.

Many see competition in no unfavourable light—between skilled and unskilled labourers, for example. There is a limited demand for them, and if their number exceeds that demand, or up to that demand if the wages are very low, the remuneration must remain the most humble possible—female spinning-mill workers, or at bleachfields, or sewing, before and after the introduction of sewing-machines, and many others, with only six shillings per week, and in proportion as they are miserably paid they are accounted fortunate in getting employment ; young hands will not have so much by one half. In times of comparative activity in trade, over-time is sought by the employer (the law benevolently restricts females to ten hours labour per day) ; but it is impolitic of workmen to comply, for extra hands ought to be employed or a rise of wages ought to be the result, as it is with commodities when demand exceeds supply. But there are two edges to this sword, and the spirit generated between employed and employers is apt to suffer ; yet there is no use to evade or shut our eyes to the fact that labour is valued in proportion to the demand and supply, the same as other marketable commodities. Thirty shillings is a common weekly wage for a skilled labourer, and others, perhaps as accomplished, but in more numbers in proportion to demand, will be the same time employed for two shillings per day. Altogether, there are very many good reasons to shorten hours of labour, even should competition continue as now experienced ; but even this cannot be ex-

pected to make a great harvest unless the leisure hours enjoyed are well spent, and accounted genuine remuneration. The improvements in modern society make the amount of manual labour fractional comparative to what was necessary only half a century ago in the production of the common articles of use and consumption. Taking an assumptive average of manual labour in production of certain necessities and luxuries of life at one half less, and if ten hours per day were then sufficient, then five hours ought now to be of equal sufficiency ; the workman having in both cases remuneration equal to common sustenance ; the physical conditions of the present worker are in many particulars superior, yet this should not greatly interfere with necessary hours of labour. It is an important and curious fact, that society's most necessary, and useless, or even vicious work, is *equally* subject to competitive selfish consideration. The necessary work of direct utility has no preference over the useless or vicious, and in many instances the useful has less remuneration. (Thieving, forging, and other vicious courses, are systemised trades, and said to bring great returns ; of course, dissipated as fast as acquired). Form an analogy : a lady's ball-dress, costing one hundred pounds—the dress serves only one night—and how much labour is dissipated on that occasion ? The very same as on an hundred pounds worth of corn. In the one case, the labourer may have been higher paid in some parts of the production than in the other, and in other parts lower ; still there is the same money value. The hundred pounds could have been exchanged for some hundred and fifty bolls of corn ; and, in regard

to society, the lady might have used or abused the same on the night of the ball, only the department of manufacture would be changed from the soft goods to the agricultural. The competition—that is, society's desire to industrial produce—is blind to what are works of utility; it would produce heathen images or gold-trimmed apparel, or working-men's houses, or public pleasure-grounds with buildings attached for a museum, billiard-table, reading-room, &c.—any given thing for war or for gift—only let the demand and money be forthcoming.

We compete in folly or in works of necessity and usefulness, according to the sanity of individual members of society. If you wanted a wooden horse to ride to the moon, only give the dimensions, and every particular will be duly attended to, if the price is sure and promptly paid when the article is finished and ready to be mounted. And the necessities of life fare no better in competition than other produce; the probability of the demand limits the amount of their production—abundance is no motive, only the anticipated gain. To have a general great abundance is not the delight of the farmer—is not his object; as great abundance as you please for each individually; but if others have less than an average crop, his pocket would be very much prettier lined. Nor will we say the farmers have this sentiment—very far from it; but the constitution of society gives this tendency, and, if they are not imbued so, we have to thank human nature, being so much superior to our conditions of life. Yet this explains how so many people are employed at next to useless labour, and the benefit to workpeople (if it will be held a benefit) of ten

hours' work per day, even with all our modern power in steam, machinery, and improvements. Dress, or other things wherein there is great value, are exactly what are wanted by those who have incomes exceeding what is necessary for life's sustenance, and consequently they ransack society for purely personal gratification.

The simple wants of nature would leave (as frequently happens) great accumulations of wealth. But the majority love personal gratification above that of hoarding or strict philanthropy, and the consequence is better in every sense for the interest of the many. It not only distributes the money, but it admits of a healthy self-reliance and self-respect from the position occupied in the manufacture, when the money has been secured by industry. Competition may be termed the bloodless war of civilisation, although in the work it would be difficult to form an estimate of its victims. While competition seems blighting, degrading, and pernicious, it is enchanting to think that emulation is all the reverse, and in every respect fitted for the whole requirements or exigencies of society. Competition, at present, is a necessary evil ; emulation is a natural and healthy condition of life—of course, a blessing.

CHAPTER VII.

MACHINERY.

MACHINERY is so intimately connected with the labouring class that we purpose making it the subject of a few remarks. Division of labour naturally accompanies machinery ; they both go together to render labour lighter, less tedious and tiresome, and the time of necessary labour for any given result shorter. Political and popular writers in general represent machinery as the handmaid of the tradesmen, and the latter frequently represent it as subversive of their work and sustenance. Both are equally narrow views, and perhaps in accordance with the different positions occupied by each party. The fact is, division of labour may be looked on as the principle which nature makes essential to man for his own developement in society, and machinery one of the chief material means by which this is accomplished. Their mutual effects at present are not permanently either good, bad, or indifferent ; but each is observed from the different stand-points from which they are viewed. It would have been an anomaly to have found a fundamentally false constitution of society, acting with a true and good principle, and the result from these to belong only to the true and good one. If the result desired must be altogether true and good, the acting principles must be

all of the divine. But hear Dr Adam Smith, the father of political economists, in reference to this :—‘ The greatest improvements in the productive powers of labour, and the greater part of the skill, dexterity, and judgment with which it is anywhere directed or applied, seem to have been the effects of the division of labour.’ All improvements have the same effect as machinery. And he says again :—‘ The intention of the fixed capital is to increase the productive powers of labour, or to enable the same number of labourers to perform a much greater quantity of work.’

‘ The employment of machinery,’ says J. R. McCulloch, Esq., ‘ and the increased facility of production consequent thereon, has also a tendency to raise the condition of the labourer, by bringing the powers of his mind more into action. Some of the most laborious operations of industry—such, for instance, as the thrashing-out of corn—are now either wholly or principally performed by machinery, the task of the labourer being confined to its construction (in which he is usually assisted by other machines) and guidance. And the presumption is, that this substitution of the powers of nature for those of man will be carried to a much further extent, and that he will be progressively still more and more employed in making new applications of their exhaustless energies.’ Is not this very beautiful?—the fortuneless members out of mind. When society itself, and all its appliances in science and art are made to serve the legitimate object for which they exist—namely, the indiscriminate benefits of our race—machinery will cease to extract encomiums

from one class, or the indignant protest of another. It is quite clear that machinery which only doubles the power of production, bringing the price of manufactured articles down one half, is simple gain for the rich to the extent of fifty per cent. on their purchase. Hence the favour in which machinery is held by many of that class. Immediately the income is more than sufficient to procure the necessities of life, the good or extra power to purchase more is most sensibly felt; and without being in a position to enjoy this advantage in some measure, we would be improved by the progress of society only in regard to the necessities of life, and that state is not yet rendered certain, and generally full of cares and troubles. But the class referred to must not conclude, because improvements and machinery are so beneficial to them, they must be equally so to all others.

Those who can only command a miserable sustenance, and perhaps save a remainder equally scanty from a sense of duty, with the purpose to avoid being paupers or in debt under ill health, or to secure in a small degree some independence of man—natural independence of position in regard to each other, not as industrial members of society—or some other infelicitous circumstances in which we are all liable to be enveloped beyond individual control—cannot receive much benefit from cheap productions which may never be, to any great extent, subjects of demand. There can be no question of the increased power of production in the necessities of life; but there is much truth in the statement, that the great amount of machinery and improvements are almost

wholly confined to those who can command them with their superabundant wealth. Hence the benefit derived by the general public is comparatively small, even on the fair side of the picture. The dark side is that where men have been brought up learning a trade, and find the demand for that learning and skill suddenly cease, in consequence of machinery doing the work at less cost. Incompetent to follow any other trade, they are forced to remain in idleness, or, in the endeavour to have a share in some other work, find the contest unequal, other applicants, having more experience in the department, and consequently more profitable, leaving them no expectation of success; and while their slender savings are being dissipated ten times quicker than they were accumulated, time hangs heavy, as if on purpose for reflection on the unnatural and unenviable position occupied.

This is misery of man's creation, and which must be remedied by him also—for if working mens' savings are effected by countless sacrifices to natural and virtuous wants, their forced dissipation is a more cruel sacrifice still, being their last and only hope of possessing one share in the world's wealth. The acquisition was truly up-hill work, even under favourable circumstances, but their absorption in non-employment leaves the victim on an inclined plane, which can admit of no doubt of the ultimate landing. The direct interest of all now is purely individual, or in the family, or if any are so happily placed for it to extend to the circle of acquaintance who mutually help each other. Another phase of direct interest we have in professions and trades from their occupying

the same relative position to society ; yet this limited common interest does not interfere with their individual interest, which clashes with all others in their immediate contact. A draper selling cloth for a coat, or an artisan bargaining for his labour, find their interest in a large profit or wage, and the buyer or employer in the reverse ; both the draper and artisan have a tacit understanding as to the profit or wage, but individual interest appears strongest to disregard this understanding, and they may be found underselling, and, if they can find an opportunity, overcharging. Machinery and improvements foster this departure from equal profits or wages, by multiplying products and superseding manual labour ; there is a pressure to get trade or employment, and this pressure appeals directly to our interest by underselling. There has been many a hero immortalised for persistency, courage, and self-sacrifice, who has not been possessed of them to the degree displayed quite common both in trade and labour. It is melancholy to acknowledge what ought to be the beneficent power of division of labour, machinery, and all improvements, instead of setting us to a hateful combat for the poor necessities of life ; and this combat cannot be at its full developement for many years to come, supposing it not to be arrested. We produce to a glut in the market, by the aid of machinery, with ease ; the machinery stops and suffers but little, but behold the workers, who have found the weekly wages wholly necessary for the weekly sustenance—they now come to find sustenance still necessary, but no wage to meet the demand. Yet it is natural we should hold on by machinery, for it naturally

is and will be undoubtedly man's servant, indeed, in some future time.

The application of power by animal or machinery, when of a questionable saving over manual labour, might on moral grounds be deprecated ; and this, perhaps, is the fact, for we have seen strikes bring into practical operation machinery which was to avoid the necessary employment of those on strike ; and also where labour is high paid and scarce, machinery and improvements are the more common, as in the case of the once United States of America. But let those improvements and machinery come into existence, they, by the mere interest the proprietors have in them, find the preference given to them in doing the work even were they and manual labour to stand equally in the balance of costs in production. The unemployed have no claim upon the proprietors of capital, but the machinery and improvements have, for if they lie unemployed it is money dead, but if employed the probability is it secures the proprietor good interest on the outlay of money. Animal power renders this necessary in a still greater degree, because their keep is greater ; they have the preference, and the labourer is unemployed—left free, in glorious liberty ! We, of course, believe this is right ; but who can shut his eyes to all these powers taking precedence of, and acting in opposition to, poor industrial labourers. They are not *his* hand-maid, nor can they be made to serve him in his present position, except in a fractional degree in comparison to their real service. Society, by its constitution, seems to have annihilated his every right but one, and

that one labour ; for when that one fails he is no more a citizen, but a pauper, a vagabond, or some other odious character. Could he but live without food, shelter, and clothing, he might remain a noble citizen, claiming and showing his equality of nature with any other ; but these necessities from nature or society's constitution, which deprive him of everything, have degraded him to the dust, cultivating his passions, and the superior sentiments are left to struggle for mastery, but too often in vain. Man is by far too noble a creature to submit to the position of becoming an inmate of a workhouse or poorhouse ; many may be degraded to such a degree, but human nature revolts at these expedencies. Yes, if we would view it in its proper light, by placing ourselves in their position, it would be greatly more revolting than has yet been pronounced. Would we force others to accept an ignoble position, which we would spurn for ourselves ! Human nature is too noble for that. Think of it—for a man or woman in the vigour of life, with a pride in duty duly performed, and a spirit of dependence only on *One*—not human. Oh ! insult added to misfortune. Grim messenger of death, where art thou ? ‘ Anywhere, anywhere out of this world.’

The class who have the fortune to be born to great wealth, with the addition of a few others who acquire riches through persevering industry or otherwise, are those from time immemorial who have had the power and influence of Government at their disposal. They are the representative class, enjoying abundance of the necessities and luxuries of life, and consequently, if otherwise

than permanently happy, it is not for want of the best and only circumstances which present society holds out for that purpose. We repudiate anything like hostility or envy to that class, and believe there would be little or no difference to the better were they replaced by as many continual grumblers; but we would calmly consider the result, which we see in society, allowing comparatively small conjugal felicity, any more than really satisfactory happiness in general in that class, while they enjoy the lion's share in the distribution of property. They are society's pets, but apparently nature's outcasts; we accept this without rejoicing, but as a pregnant lesson. The poor, in their difficulties, are frequently tempted to remark the disproportion or inequality in the distribution of wealth; but the practice of holding persons of any class responsible for what is obviously the result of principle, is about exploded, even in those whose neglected education might have been some justification for the error.

Nature seems to bring all classes to an approximation to community, or mutual dependence for happiness or misery on the whole race, and more immediately in nations and communities—one class cannot have 'perfect happiness,' and another of the same community be in a state of misery. This feature of society is influenced by machinery, for it is naturally diffusive, although our eyes cannot be shut to the fact that it enhances the wealth and power of the already wealthy and powerful, and renders the poor more dependent on those wealthy and powerful. It cheapens the raw material of many commodities; it increases the product of the manufacture

of all material; it admits of service being rendered in superior livery. The rich enjoy all these, and the continual cheapening leaves overplus for further and further expenditure in works of elegance, arts, and fancy. If labour was paid equal in proportion to the production of past years, before modern improvements, the wages of many would be an hundred times more; but the price being at that higher standard, the demand would be proportionably limited, like that of the past, so the wage would be the same, with the time of necessary labour shortened in proportion to the improvement—ten hours in every hundred days.

The common fashion of keeping the hours of labour stationary gives the whole advantage to the rich, and forces the superfluous hands to find other work. They engage in superfluous arts, and find purchasers among those who have saved expenditure in the works which have been cheapened. From these remarks it is obvious that machinery diffuses benefits, and, as above noticed, the rich are the principal participators, because every reduction in price of life's necessities, luxuries, and fine-art productions, is gain, directly and indirectly, to them. If machinery could multiply farms, houses, and capital, as it does manual labour, the benefits and competitions would extend equally to the rich and to the poor; but while money and property are made subjects of remuneration for the possessors, the poor would always stand at a disadvantage, even if this impossible result from machinery did exist. Manual labour has its limits, but property-possessing extends to great bounds; hence, on

the standard of society's constitution, it is in vain for the poor to cope with the rich. While we conscientiously believe the poor have an impassable barrier to be on an equality with the rich, it must not be imputed a difficulty not to be overcome, for equality of individual possessions is not the means to be used in effecting the cure of the common and unnecessarily wide-spread misery. With this in mind, machinery may have bestowed greater benefits, and fewer permanent evils, to the working classes than at first sight appears. The benefits are principally in its construction, in the power it gives of production, and consequently cheapening of articles of common use. But can this demand for more mechanical works go on increasing with the increase of products from machinery? for, in the path we have taken, to remain stationary is slow starvation to the many.

When other countries are as fully supplied with machinery as ourselves—what then? Would not society have all the evils at present existing—nay, rather all of them greatly intensified? So long as railways, all sorts of steam-engines, manufacturing machinery, and all expensive works of productive utility, or of taste and elegance, are on the increase, there will be considerable health in demand of labour. But we know at the best there is no satisfactory result; yet the keeping us employed, and consequently in the necessaries of life, of course is so far good, although the best in present society is, in its nature and truth, very indifferent in comparison to what is desirable. Low prices of the necessaries of life is of first importance for a people, and whatever tends

to this result is good ; but these prices are generally the effect of nature's bounty rather than society's prudential arrangements.

We are here almost on the subject which previously passed before our notice, namely, the system by which society exists in its organised state. It appeared then—and there is no reason to change—that the annual expenditure of interest and rent effects what permanent vitality there is to be found ; whether trade be brisk or languid, this is the trunk of the tree, on which the branches and every twig is supported. Persons there will be who see only the connection of the branches ; but a little closer attention, and the whole is obvious. We have brisk trade from liberal outlay of accumulated money, and especially when that outlay is on productive property. Languid trade arises from interest and rent being either not all spent, or spent only on necessities and luxuries ; these two may frequently be found existing at one time. With this view, it will be perceived that the creation and general working of machinery is really subservient to the universal, although not equal, diffusion of wealth in society. Therefore, when machinery is working in competition with men—to their ruin in a pecuniary sense—it must be attributed to society's constitution, for machinery, like division of labour, extensive knowledge, persevering industry, and all improvements in manufactures, are in their natural results purely beneficent—directly serviceable to those who take the advantage of their operations. That being the fact, those directly injured in pecuniary affairs must be ra-

tional and prudent enough not to wait in such a position till ruin overtakes them, but endeavour to find another sphere or department of employment ; and as persevering industry, with prudence, generally commands success, the door of hope is not closed, although the cloud of misfortune for some time threaten the path of life.

We must put up with inconveniences which are incidental to a vicious state of society (what cannot now be cured must be endured) until, at least, a majority of the people have come to view the conditions we live in to be degrading, and better conditions apparent ; then the demand for the latter will most assuredly arise in its place.

CHAPTER VIII.

GENERAL EFFECTS FROM THE PROPERTY PRINCIPLE
IN SOCIETY.

WE shall now take a glimpse of society under two aspects—the bright side and the dark side. First, the common idea of the bright or fair side of society naturally directs our eye to the well-to-do—those in independent circumstances. This does not suit us, as they are such a small minority of the whole people. Besides, nature has produced us all, so in this we are equal, and view each other as brethren of one family; consequently, where the great majority are out of the pale of that class, they must expect to have no greater importance than their numerical strength would warrant. If the extremes of poverty and riches are inimical to happiness, as is generally believed, they will be dispensed with without great injury to our remarks of either phase of society; and if the case cannot be made out quite clearly from the more fortunate and moderately-possessed members of society, it must fall to the ground, because the best at present existing is but very indifferent to what ought to be generally experienced.

The male members, and a section of the females, have to begin the business of life in some trade or profession, and to thoroughly succeed is to call forth congratulations

of self and friends. In this success may have been many favourable causes, or there may have been excellent management; but the result is substantially the same—an accumulation of wealth, which is the desired success. In the beginning of this course there may have been cares and fears, sometimes joy and bright hopes; for no hand-to-mouth working and living, making the expenditure balance with the income, can for one moment be considered satisfactory, but there must be enough of the luxuries to insure comfort, and a surplus sufficient to give the mind a sentiment of security for the future. The tide of success having evidently set in, the bright side of society enjoyed, and its evils seem greatly medicated, the mind assumes a tone congenial to beneficent and happy associations. Among those are frequently found some who naturally fall into a grand mistake by their blind acquisitiveness. This degrading weakness is too exclusively developed, its strength increasing with its wealth and age. Even here their own peculiar joy is certain, but how circumscribed! How unlike those beings who find all nature administer to their happiness! or those who make large circles of acquaintance, where mutual respect and esteem enhance life's whole voyage with genial sunshine! Some acquisitiveness is necessary, we might say to all, and especially successful business-people; but the intellect is the supreme ruler of all the impulses, acquisitiveness included, and disregard of its monitions is followed by punishment, in the curtailment of pleasure, even as in other natural laws with which we are in immediate connection.

Well, the resources having become of sufficient importance for living in affluence, what is the first thing thought of? A nice house, and grand domestic establishment; two or more public rooms superbly furnished, and little used; servants of both sexes to do all necessary work, while master and mistress eat, drink, dress, and move about doing next to nothing. This the *beau-ideal* of great success in the fight or race for riches. Is this a grand consummation after years of business activity? Many who could easily accomplish that prefer remaining in the harness; not so much for further accumulations as for active and useful occupation, which is as natural to us, while we are able, as any other refreshment to the mind and body. This selfish independence from useful activity may be viewed by many as desirable, but it is opposed to the spirit and letter of the doctrines of Jesus Christ, as well as the teachings of our own and external nature. Common habits and ideas in forming our second nature have made the selfish property principle the groundwork of our every sentiment, and almost obliterated the natural impulses of duty to our neighbour and dignified respect in ourself. The morality of nature is reversed—self is first, duty afterwards.

There is undisguised pleasure in becoming possessed of a fine mansion, and the congratulations of others in having 'come to your kingdom'; at least, if anything mars the felicity of life, it is not attributed to the elevation in the scale of wealth and material comfort. Every desirable luxury and comfort is either within the establishment, or money, with its well-known power, brings with speed

any amount of these desirables from without. There are dinner-parties and supper-parties, engravings, statues, and oil paintings in abundance ; the garden and vineries are of the first class ; clothes of the most expensive and most fashionable. An airing is necessary to assist digestion, but walking is not respectable ; a horse for the young, and a carriage for the matured. Silver plate is extensively necessary, and every other costly thing to accord. The master of the house is in a conventional straight-jacket—he dare not go and supply himself with some refreshment ; and the mistress is no better—she cannot be seen in the kitchen, and to take the tongs to lift a few pieces of coal from the scuttle to replenish the fire would endanger her friendships by losing caste, and the very idea might terribly shake gentle nerves. As there is no end nor any great object to be obtained in the company of these luxurious luminaries, who never dream their every action is selfish, we must drop them, and find another phase of the bright side of society.

Wealth, property, riches—call it what you will—has less to do with the bright side of life than at first we are apt to believe ; for although wealth is made the bright side of life in present society, it is opposed to nature—it is opposed to truth. Nature proclaims a common duty to diffuse elevated happiness—happiness which has no bitter reflections, but full of sweet reminiscences. What has this to do with selling at a great advantage, or taking twice or three times the wages in the manufacturing of some article ? Yes, happiness has the stamp of the true, the divine, the bright side of human nature, in whatever

state of moderation our financial affairs exist. And it is not to be believed that such happiness can exist out of the true, the divine, the right conduct of individuals. The idea of happiness from wealth alone, if held, is delusion. In such a life, the particles of happiness must be from particles of nature—of truth; for be it remembered there only can be a mixture, and a very little of the false permanently blemishes a character—the good, and true must, and generally does predominate, whether or not opposed to society's favourite constitution of property.

The happiest class in our nation or race must owe this largely to their superior balanced mental powers, with no weakness by which they might be stopped or turned aside from the rational resolutions of their happy instincts. The rational must naturally be the guiding star; and popular Mammon-worship, and its opposite, extreme thoughtlessness, must be equally avoided by those who would drink deepest of the sacred water of life.

It is a common remark, as it is a common occurrence, that children enjoy a flow of animal spirits, a light cheerfulness of disposition, an earnestness and singleness of purpose that quite fascinates and endears them to every person who can appreciate the virtues of the human heart. They, as yet, have not been introduced to the wise institutions of man—they have not yet been materially impressed by the education in store for them in our incoherent community; the virtue inherent in human nature is yet uncorrupted, and, consequently, they are recipients of proportionally more happiness. These external circumstances, subversive of all that is pure, inno-

cent, and true, when they evidently disagree with the rational instincts, must be viewed with suspicion, and allowed no more influence over us than they deserve and necessitate. It is when the conduct is thus preserved more pure by our vigilance over self that we reduce what little of our conduct which could in one degree be questioned, and see what in the past we would have amended or bettered—the actions being kept up to our best light, rational to the extent of our judgment, the reflecting and conscious self enjoys a tranquil repose, an elastic individuality of spirit, and the natural smile or tear of innocence. We are necessarily in a state of difficulties, and absolutely perfect conduct is purely impossible. But the resolve must be permanent to strike the target, and the bull's-eye is the mark—perfection.

Our positions at present are truly mournful. How can we know when to refuse the beggar's or impostor's, or scoundrel's petition? He may or may not be a worthy brother. He may or may not make a good use of the alms. Can we see such without grief—not to particularise old persons and children? Are we sure we do right by being *generous*, for it is a seducing power, while we may not be absolutely *just* in having our own debts discharged? Our possessions are legal; but are they just? Do they not encroach on others' just claims? Or are our possessions next to nothing but the ability to labour, and much of it for meagre necessities, with a resigned spirit, and not one particle of envy for the possessions of the rich? Would we be indifferent that benefits should go to a worthy neighbour and not to self?—but, above all,

that truth and right—which is truth in practice—should reign now and ever among us mortal creatures? Yes, our positions are full of difficulties, and nothing better have we to overcome them than our rational faculties. It is our duty to cultivate and thoroughly develop these faculties, not only as individuals, but by means emanating from the corporated body of society, that each might attain the utmost happiness possible—at the same time presenting to society our individuality under the most favourable conditions.

Even in the most favourable view attainable of present society, there is a fair share of chagrin, ennui, want of sympathy, or other apparently trifling cause, to disturb the flow of the happy; but those of higher sensibility find many more serious subjects of grief and unhappiness. It is not possible to shut our eyes to the amount of disease and death, from want of due nourishment and other comforts—in one word, poverty; and this poverty is as natural to property as darkness is to light. But human nature is shocked by it, and we instinctively know, as a nation or community, we are responsible for its existence; and our duty is clearly to mitigate, and, if possible, have it extirpated. Our benevolent institutions exist for this purpose, and they are a bright feature of present society, although not to be compared with absolute prevention in as far as possible. They are reflected good—not the clear light of noon-day—by being upheld principally by contributions of money which little trouble the donor. Nor are the recipients always benefited morally; but, like all charity, it degrades the natural sense of equality in

man, except they also subscribe according to their means.

These institutions, however, ought not to be requisite ; they are expedient now, but they may cease to be expedient, and this would be much more desirable. For instance, the most important are for the cure of disease, yet health is the normal state of life ; the workshop and home made habitable would be a greater boon than killing people by small degrees, and giving them a chance to recover by a week or a month's proper treatment. But poverty and its accompanying wretchedness is the great necessity which brings them all into existence ; yet it is certain that equal and good conditions in life are the birthright of every member of society : equality of duties, and also at the feast, perfect equality as children of one common parent, is the normal and only just position in life.

Thus, in the brightest features of present society, there is much to deplore—much to grieve over. And what happiness there is, after some moderate amount of wealth, is not as society's constitution would lead us to expect in more and more wealth, but rather in a pure conscience and a catholic spirit from well-cultivated habits, with a sound rational understanding. If the barriers to the latter are great—so is the prize ; but it is mournful so many are deluded into paths far removed from the proper course. Truth is the antidote for our wretched conditions of life, and it is no less common than efficacious ; but marvellous and melancholy as is the fact, truth is as yet literally, as well as peculiarly,

the *open secret*. Hence the brightest side of society is, unexceptionally, unsatisfactory.

It will be inferred from the preceding remarks that our estimate of the dark side of society shall be unfortunately in the ascendant. It is true—for the great majority of persons are so absorbed with their hardships, misfortunes, burdensome duties, &c., as to render it questionable if they have, in their maturity, experienced happiness. For want of good conditions of life, and sound sense, they make a world for themselves of ‘vexation of spirit,’ or at most they rise not above ‘all is vanity.’ No doubt society’s constitution is responsible for all this, although it is denied to have anything to do with it. Since it usurps the place of that constitution which would have the responsibility and which would give the necessary better conditions of life and cultivated intellect, it must acknowledge the fruits of its own power. Private property is the foundation of society’s constitution, and unquestionably the master or monster evil. What evil temptations and influences doth it not present to us all as errors of commission? and what good exercises and powers doth it not neglect for our welfare as errors of omission? The latter is negative, and consequently cannot be charged so directly; but the former is positively of clear malign influence, from the most insinuating and apparently trifling circumstances up to the most direct, barefaced dishonesty.

Holding absolute possession of property to be false in every respect, what can such notions, engendered from our infancy, produce, but that of error, and consequently misery? Error is the mother of all evil, even as truth is

of all good. Exceptional error is easily remedied ; but error at the foundation or source pollutes or frustrates any possibility of good of all that follow. The same with truth : it is essentially necessary to the healthy action of the mental and practical, even as pure food is to our bodies. Theoretical error might be overlooked were it confined to theory ; but it is woven into our lives—the evil is rendered necessary by the practice in private property. Although the evil eliminated stamps its error, its practice gives it an artificial appearance of truth—unquestionable truth ; but so much the worse must be the effects. Practice establishes the fact as to the practice, but it must have a higher test and more sure foundation to be just and true. How much practice, founded on error, has been and passed away ? Witness the cruel destruction of witches (the practice evidently pure error) of little more than a century ago, or the capital punishment for paltry thefts, or the holding of our fellow-creatures as chattel.

If anything is certain in the past as well as the present of man, it is his liability to grievously err, both in belief and practice. People have been too much led ; they have been and do still forget their individual sovereignty, wherein duty and responsibility are employed ; there is no privilege to a class to know what is right in belief and practice, but it is a common and universal duty and responsibility on every person from the common superior source. The common sentiment of people who do not know what equality is advocated, say, ‘that were the world’s wealth divided to all equally to-morrow, in a

short time the same distinctions from poverty and riches would be soon predominant as now.' In their sense this cannot be questioned, and few or none say it is desirable ; but as an answer to no individual property it is evasive and delusive, and they have been deceived or deceive themselves who accept it as a solution against the doctrine of social equality. But this flimsy covering cannot long conceal the question of present society's impotence for anything good ; social reformers must, ere long, encounter the subject in its entirety, whether it may be accepted or rejected. The present fact which we have to do with is the inherent tendency of the private property principle and practice to create these artificial distinctions, which are totally evil.

We need not refer particularly to the miser's mental corruption, or those of dominant pride, vanity, arrogance, tyranny, &c., &c. It might be objected that the innate powers or mental functions have a leaning to these vices, but far stronger reasons are in favour of giving our social state the credit for their cultivation. Besides, as a community, what more important duty can exist than that of fulfilling nature's design for our own children or race, which is, that the rational judgment shall curb and encourage the impulses to effect the ideal perfection to which human nature may attain. The social state fails in its legitimate duty when it fails in the training of the young shoot to be useful to society, and a blessing to itself as well as an honour and characteristic example of our divine nature. Have we not seen the budding of vice in a child receiving a small coin, exhibiting it to his playmates,

while the pride of power rose on his cheek, and dejection was depicted on the others? Is this not in miniature an indication of society's developed vices? Harmony, union, or association is rent asunder, to the triumph of isolation, incoherence, and selfishness.

The wealthy wallow in luxuries, and the poor ape them as if this was the chief object in life. The artificial power given by private property is often the first cause of all this, and always a necessary accomplice. And this forms a practical lesson for youth, which they may be as apt to learn as some more commendable pursuit. Custom deadens the iniquity, and a questionable standard of character is fostered which is no less disreputable to ourselves than to the country and State in which we live. But evils more palpable, that come more home to our deadened moral feelings, are quite as common as those to which we have referred.

Non-success in life is the grand accompaniment to the dark side of society; nor must it be supposed that constant or steady employment runs the recipient clear of this non-success. It is far otherwise when only a small income, perfectly inadequate to the necessities of the family, is its reward. They are at misery's door if ill health or an accident overtake the head of the family; if thoughtful, how can they be but ever in an anxious state of mind? The employment is probably carried on under injurious conditions for health, and a long contact with these conditions brings premature ill health and death.

A certain M.D. tells us:—'The injuriousness of the

worst occupations is not unavoidable ; certainly not uncounteractable. No occupation by which man may honestly earn his bread need be, should be, *per se*, unwholesome. Employments owe their malign influence to the unfavourable circumstances of the employed—to the wilful systematic violation of sanitary laws under which they are pursued. The cupidity of the employer, and the recklessness of the workmen, are the greatest disseminators of disease.' And look at the time at work!—as many hours daily as when fifty persons would have been required for the same amount of production as the single one now in many, if not an average, of all departments of industry. Is it not slavery riveting its own chains ; and, probably, at the same time rearing a family for a similar destiny ? Who knows ? or who would desire it ?

The accumulation of wealth in a nation, and into comparatively few hands, may be viewed with satisfaction as the world goes now ; but the instinct of our natures repudiates all this for mental and moral—intellectual and heart-felt—happiness, which we have not yet arrived at, but must be forthcoming. Listen to the gentle and feeling Shelley, in his 'Masque of Anarchy,' how the poor conditions of lowly life must have affected him :—

' What is Freedom ? Ye can tell
That which Slavery is too well,
For its very name has grown
To an echo of your own.

' Tis to work and have such pay
As just keep life from day to day ;

In your limbs, as in a cell,
For a tyrant's use to dwell.

' So that ye for them are made
Loom and plough, and sword and spade ;
With or without your own will, bent
To their defence and nourishment.

What is Slavery?—

' 'Tis to be a slave in soul,
And to hold no strong control
Over your own will, but be
All that others make of ye.

Finishing—

' Rise like lions after slumber
In unvanquishable *number* !
Shake your chains to earth like dew ;
Ye are many—they are few.'

It is good that to think on this subject is to be uncomfortable; and also, that generally the poor toiling millions in past time have rarely been sensible of the lowly condition they have occupied. Yet the proper appreciation of that state must be the forerunner of a more intellectual and elevated condition of life. If this opens up a possibility of more suffering, it also leaves open a glory and happiness in prospect surpassing everything in the past. The responsibility and misery must rest with the many; not with knaves and intriguers of states, for they (we think them superior in this country), like maggots feeding on corruption, when it ends, are no more. The people have just to 'know the truth, and the truth shall make them free;' then corruption ends indeed.

What can we expect from a higher development of the present state of society? More ingenuous laws, and not less ingenuous perversion and invasion of them; larger individual fortunes and more enlarged good, bad, and indifferent methods of using them; stronger grasp of poverty and want, weaker feelings of self-respect, followed by deeper degradation and despair; more use of the narcotic tobacco, and in others more distaste of its use; for one class, more stimulating liquors, and another seeks those natural and pure. Every virtue and vice will have its own development, with its particular devotees, not excepting that vice (perhaps as hurtful although more excusable than many of the others) of excess of fashion in clothing, instead of suitability, for purposes of comfort and taste. Money always is cheapest where it is most secure, and the rich, of course, will have the advantage over the poor; the former borrow at three or four per cent., and the poor find it very much heavier if they have occasion to go to their bankers—Loan Societies and Pawnbrokers.

The recent calling into existence of this latter business has been brought prominently forward as illustrative of the evils in society. The use and the abuse are very different, whether in regard to bankers or pawnbrokers, and the destruction of either would be a poor mode of cure for abuse in either. It is deplorably common for one person to pawn another's article, and using the money on drink or otherwise; but not less common, by direct loans, do we find one person defrauding another, even to their ruin. In this respect parents often suffer by their

own children. The purse strings must be kept close and secure from friends and strangers ; individualism requires self-production. Thus we come to the outrageous condition of actual want, or the fear of it, in regard to the supply of necessities and luxuries of life : this is not only the cause of much immediate misery, but it acts as a latent motive to an inexpressible amount.

Persons exist who never knew what it was to want necessities and luxuries, or anything nearly approaching it, have had their whole lives directed, and cramped and chagrined to avoid the very idea. Vain hope!—they often suffer more than those who may have had its pressure more than once, in knowing a week's sustenance to be more than they could promise themselves. This is at once the common condition and vital principle acting, which society's constitution makes necessary ; nothing of public importance is done without a reward, which is for the relief of our daily wants. Priests have their stipends, lawyers their fees, placemen their salaries, merchants their profits, and workmen their wages ; and what are each and all but means for an end—that end the securing the necessities and comforts of each class and their dependants ?

As we said before, it is the non-success in these that brings out specially the darker phases of society ; yet in no case is there exemption from much unnecessary troubles, cares, and anxieties. Take the common conduct of men entering the business of life : they require support during the time they are learning ; and, if liberally supplied with money-power, they are probably ruined ; if deficient, they fret ; and the feelings which ought to

exist are less or more severed. Whether we look to the parents or the young men, there are unnecessary difficulties. A young man is somewhat impressible, easily led, and the temptations are all around him of the most questionable character. He acquires with pride the fashionable small virtues, follies, and vices so common in his position of life. They gradually acquire power over him; and, to carry them out, he is in want of more and more money. These are critical moments; but he at length becomes a salaried workman, and whether or not he requires support from his parents, he decidedly feels at liberty to spend money and acquire habits which are objectionable; and his parents are happily fortunate if some remaining affection for them exists than what is largely composed of selfish utility or interest.

We would rather see it otherwise; but it is too seldom witnessed, that tender affection, so natural under the circumstances, which anticipates the wants and delights in serving and giving pleasure to the parents. These impressible young men like company and pleasure for themselves, which form habits requiring all the money they can command, and destroy the possibility of life being a success to themselves or whoever connect their lives with them. We do not think of blaming them, for they may have many virtuous characteristics, and have been ruined by miserable external conditions. All those who desire the continuance of these wretched external circumstances must bear the responsibility. On the other hand, the unimpressible son will have a course for himself when the outward influence is opposed to his

mind ; not that the world will not affect his character, but it will not have all its own way. He may go into its foibles and vices, but his resolutions will keep him from becoming their slave.

He may be affectionate or not, acquisitive or not, comparatively, for all mental functions are co-existing in degrees which form combinations the most varied ; but in all probability his life will be a success. Every one has the wish, but this class has the self-control which ultimately gains its point. However lowly that position may be, it will be really respectable in a wordly sense, because they have eminent self-respect and independence. But what object for all this perseverance and industry ? they will most assuredly reflect. And who would say that any success in life was enough, if happiness was not predominant ? Yet this success is to many a sacrifice of self, and the fact never far from the thoughts—what a cramped, miserable life ! Real contentment is little known, and is perhaps entirely impossible in the inhuman competition of steam-power and machinery ; or is it just the natural fruit of the tree we have planted of individual property ?—for contentment and pure pleasure are wider spread than in the past.

Labour is necessary, and not only unobjectionable in its performance, but can be rendered very pleasant ; yet the labour generally performed in society is repulsive under the guidance of the ever powerful principle of property, which subverts the natural combinations and conditions necessary to make it attractive. Generally, work is carried on at a vast sacrifice of economy, individualism forcing

or making this necessary ; in another phase we have capital instead of merit representing the management ; in another the production is looked well after, but the conditions the producers occupy in that production is too often overlooked ; even men working on their own account cannot well help themselves.

There is a want of a true and common singleness of interest in all industry—a union of purpose and of understanding between all engaged. Confidence or trust in persons is shattered to ribbons ; but let those persons be possessed of abundance of wealth, behold the change !—our trust is not in the most meritorious persons, but the greatest wealth. We ourselves have done this work of desecration. Our god is wealth, and in our worship we have trampled under foot the representative living miracle, from superior power.

The organisation of productive labour, where on an extensive scale, although greatly deficient, is by no means one of the worst features of present society. Labour in its most humble aspect—that is where least remunerated—is generally connected with all that is most wretched (not wicked or criminal) in society. This is easily accounted for : people who will, or are forced from necessity, continue working where they cannot procure enough for their simple sustenance, in course of time are reduced to want, and want of credit also—for prudent merchants never neglect to find out quickly when persons are least able to support themselves. We need not refer to the duplicity practised by all classes to support more and more credit ; for honest people this door is not open. And what could be more melancholy than a human being

without the power, yet in want of that power to procure the first necessities of life—without credit in consequence of poverty, but free of debt—without active sympathy, and in want of death? How monstrous, yet natural! Who dare deny the pandemonium character of present society? It requires of us what is impossible, and kicks us for that fact alone. The earth is our mother; and is society, then, our step-mother? No, no; she is a perfect imposition, not one drop of a mother in her veins; the earth raised her not—but man hath, to his loss and sorrow.

Individualism requires us all to manage our own monetary affairs, and it requires very little insight of character to see the great majority of people undertake this with compunction, and generally incapable of its performance with any great degree of wisdom. The position is contrary to nature, and hence the utter inability many display. There is a complexity of duties involved which only some people can overtake, and of these many have unwillingly to engage in the grovelling but necessary work. Great prudence and a little training might bring one to it, but where confidence in others is so scarce, or insecure, it must in proportion lose the attraction which naturally belongs to work. Some persons despise the strictest economy, others go heart and soul for saving money; if both are wrong, their different mental characteristics give that tendency, and they cannot be transformed nor formed to conventional necessities. If harmony of action is to be ever existing, the duties imposed must be changed or withdrawn.

Human nature can never subscribe to the necessities of

the individual property system, such as abundance of wealth for one, and another without the amount to satisfy hunger—to the everlasting existence of temptation to theft, and, through it, to an indefinite amount of crime ; to a principle and practice pregnant with innumerable bitter differences of opinion and duties in those connected in the inviolable relationship of domestic life, and which give all an opposing interest to each other in buying and selling, which not only tends to neutralise the natural feelings of respect and esteem for others, but frequently raises false suspicions and unfounded prejudices towards each other.

To illustrate present society, we are aware that statistical statements of corruption in high places, prostitution, criminals, jails, lunatics, bankruptcies, law pleas, brothels, pawnbrokers, workhouses, poorhouses, and pauperism would be very effective in demonstrating the existing evils ; but is this necessary, when every daily and weekly newspaper sends forth a supply to satisfy the greatest sceptic ? Then there are personal cases, more telling on the feelings, and not less common. Law courts are where such cases become public (no person would desire private ones, however common), and one of the most wide blown has lately appeared in that of Yelverton. But let us look where there is less *breed* and guilt, and not less suffering.

We have known no public reports so replete with society's dark side as those in the Morning Chronicle of 'London Labour and the Poor.' In these, many of the humble but necessary habitations of industry are visited

and found the scenes of the most heartrending miseries—immorality and crime resulting from necessity. The foundation of this necessity is individualism. In one house, a sloop-worker says:—‘The doctor told me that if I did not ask the parish for relief, I should be guilty of murder (of his wife), but I could not so far degrade myself.’ What shall we say of young female workers confessing prostitution at times from necessity, to meet the expenses of a miserable subsistence? A coal-whipper’s wife to the reporter said:—‘Poor people assist poor people ; you know that, sir.’ This class are imprudent to a great degree—slaves to drink, which robs the family, and degrades them in return for the money ; but custom has gained the ascendant, and circumstances peculiarly encourage its predominance.

Every one has heard of the Spitalfield weavers, their interesting location, and now what they have come to. ‘The average time for labour before 1824 was ten hours a day ; now it is fourteen.’ They then had fourteen shillings and sixpence a week ; now only four shillings and sixpence. In the mercantile marine we find:—‘When the master is ignorant, the crew see that very soon, and take advantage of it. There is no longer good discipline ; and, in case of danger, the men have little confidence in the master, so that the difficulties increase.’

Poverty and gentility are common conditions of great misery, even when accompanied with ‘honesty, sobriety, activity, and virtue.’ Just hear:—‘I hate it (prostitution) with all the strength of my heart ; all my nature revolts against it. God alone knows how I struggled to

escape it.' 'I made up my mind to commit suicide,' &c., &c. The person engaged in the inquiry says:—'I had seen so much want since I began my investigation, that my feelings were almost blunted to sights of ordinary misery; but I was unprepared for the amount of suffering that I have lately witnessed. I could not have believed that there were human beings toiling so long, and gaining so little, and starving so silently and heroically, round about our own homes.' Ledru Rollin treats of this subject, and properly remarks:—'After contemplating these scenes, however, it would be blasphemy to God did we not acknowledge that the evil is less in nature than in the spirit of human institutions.'

We might have referred to the reports of agricultural employments; they received attention, and were found to have a reverse side from 'rural felicity.' Their wages are on a par with their hovels of houses. One labourer says;—'When we have no money to buy bread with, what does it matter to us whether it be dear or cheap?' The report, which went the round of the newspapers showing the apartments occupied, with the number of occupants, testifies their condition to be worse than skilled artizans' generally are. But what are we to say for such excessive toil and wretchedness on the one hand, and on the other no necessary toil, and the utmost luxuriance of living? Which of the couple are the most unnatural? Is either desirable or justifiable? When we have answered these to our satisfaction, we may listen to an agricultural employer, no doubt an exception, on rural felicity:—'A labourer, with a family of five chil-

dren, can buy enough of bread with six shillings a-week, if he has the lowest quality; he generally pays his rent with his harvest money; he gets his clothing somehow—sometimes it is given him; and when he is without work, why, then we put him in the workhouse. Thus, you see, with six shillings per week he is amply provided for.’

East India is one of the richest quarters of the world; but these riches considerably failed last year, and, of course, the rich, along with the institutions they uphold, made no proper endeavour to meet the exceptional demands of the poor people. ‘We hear (Daily Telegraph, April, 1861) as yet of no alleviation in the anguish endured by the poor throughout a vast extent of British India. The horrors of the famine still spread over an expanding circle, and the bodies of the dead and dying encumber the public roads. Our countrymen, roused by strenuous appeals, have already done more for the starving Hindoo and Mohammedan than the bloated native merchant-princes of Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta, whose princes in former epochs left the hunger-stricken to perish by tens of thousands, while their palanquins jingled by with golden bells and bracelets on the arms of the bearers.’

It is only the poor anywhere who know what famine is in reality; and, no doubt, the individualism of present society is the chief cause, in its comparatively small production of necessaries, in the first instance, and, again, in its not being duly supplied in time from other countries, for it pretends to no such duty and responsibility, so the dire calamity is experienced to the outrage of all

human feeling. The poor are in the midst of hardships in this country, but in no other old country will you find that class so well.

We do not pretend to include the excessively imprudent, who must, in the present state of society, bear the effects of their imprudence, or sacrifice the privilege of personal liberty, as semi-insane, for they are perfectly incapable in the circumstances. We are almost tempted to present a few sketches of the poor in other countries, but this was not agreed for, and certainly they do not generally call forth agreeable feelings. Beggary—beggary in spirit and in fact—is almost everywhere conspicuous. It is said, and probably with truth, that a human being might be starved to death and the body present no indications of disease; but this does not apply to the common condition of the low living of the poverty-stricken. Ever subsisting on coarse and indigestible food, neither quantity nor quality being sufficient, the body becomes enervated, liable to colds, rheumatisms, ulcers, &c., &c.

No doubt, too much quality and quantity of food are as commonly injurious, and make more doctors' bills; but the one does not cure the other, and only makes two evils, where none, by their mixture, ought to exist; and the latter is purely a case of imprudence, while the former is necessity, requiring public sympathy and help. The greater miseries of life are not connected with the supply of the necessaries of life; they are in our social and domestic organisation from necessity. We were to illustrate some of these by cases before us, but now hesi-

tate. Every person of common observation and experience can detect many from among those in his own neighbourhood. How poor their leisure-hour occupations—how incompatible their society to each other—how much vexation and chagrin in over-toil—how unnatural and reprehensible duties devolve on children—how impossible to give the young anything like good treatment—they are legion, and all from necessity beyond personal control, but not beyond our united control. Our happiness for life is hinged on many of the commonest accidents or occurrences of life.

We are told ‘The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.’ There is need of being assured of the same in regard to individualism. They are made and exist for man. If useful, well and good; if their day of service has absolutely gone, they are properly superseded. They are altogether within human authority; but if we add a characteristic of any institution for multiplying misery, degrading human nature, and absolutely erroneous, why should we linger in the exercise of our legitimate authority? This is not the time to advocate impossibilities; but who shall deny the desirability of superseding this individualism, or defend its malign nature? Just imagine the old principle and practice of hand-spinning held to be inviolable; yet it would be difficult to find out one principle and practice of a more useful nature than this institution at one time was, although now extinct (in our part of the world at least). Nor is the attack on human nature better founded which throws censure and evil effects entirely on individual responsibility.

We cannot question having the innate impulses of our being from superior power, and the cultivation and training of those impulses is left to society. It is both unwilling and unable to undertake the duty, but being the chief power existing for that particular duty, it cannot avoid the responsibility of effecting what is existing. It sets us in opposition to each other; instead of treating and training us with gentleness and forbearance, it treats us as beasts of burden, and sneers at our degradation instead of encircling us with the spirit of kindness and affection; it leaves its citizens to perish with hunger and cold, or in breaking one's soul and heart in begging charity. Yet how blind people are! In their simplicity, they will believe the evils of society are from individual remissness of duty—anything but the principle emanating out of property, which sends its influence throughout the whole ramifications of society and on the face of it, is evil. We are frightened at its gigantic stature, and so accustomed to its tyrannical sway, that opposition, or even questioning its authority, is never dreamed of. But consider our power when united, and its utter falsity and banefulness the prompting cause for our united action, then it will succumb as any other inanimate power or matter.

Persons of genius, of fine feelings and intellect, strong impulses from nature, which no artificial conventionalism can turn aside—they are particularly interesting. Many will be born in poverty, but rise to eminence and perhaps wealth; others will never make head-way in accumulation, however favourable the circumstances, but rather run through a moderate fortune in a short time. These

cases might illustrate the vicious principle and practice overruling us. Allow us to remind you of Burns. The story of Burns' family is full of the subject in hand. He had excellent parents, full of sound sense. His mother, besides the many domestic virtues of her sex, had a large store of old songs and ballads, which she liberally taught to her family. His father was exemplary in his steady and intelligent character, as well as praiseworthy for the care and tuition he bestowed on his family; but they were poor. The young family were no sooner able to run than the over-toiled and necessitous parents required their assistance to provide the necessaries of life. The poor man's god—toil, for independence of man—the father was unable to satisfy, and death kindly stepped in in time to save him from a common jail.

The eldest son and poet's life is, or ought to be, well known. He had stifling, withering, jovial—a moment bright, and again unfortunate and more unwholesome—conditions of life. Nature may be sending others similar in characteristics and wretchedness in poverty; at any rate, the chances are life here may be found not greatly bettered. Allan Cunningham will speak of him:—‘I have, in the life of the poet, asserted that he was in great poverty before he died, and that sometimes, in the course of the spring of 1796, his family were all but wanting bread. Those who say he had good friends around him seem not to know that he had a soul too proud to solicit help, and to forget that there are hearts in the world ready to burst before they beg.’ Hear another (Motherwell) on the same:—‘We attach blame

to no one and to no party ; but we cannot conceal from ourselves the mournful fact, knowing, as we almost fancy we do, the writhings and workings of such a mind as Burns was endowed with, that he literally died of a broken heart.'

What must we say of this necessary poverty ? Is it a consolation ? It is no crime ! The continuance of it is a perfect disgrace to every nation. The deluded and trampled down poverty-stricken creatures think their condition no crime ! If it is no crime, why should certain cases be treated worse than criminals ?

'Who knows not that poverty (says Louis Blanc) is nigh to the human mind, and confines education within the most disgraceful limits ? Poverty incessantly counsels the sacrifice of personal dignity ; nay, almost always enforces it. Poverty renders dependent characters independent by nature—thus converting a virtue into a new source of torment, and turning the native generosity of blood to bitterest gall. If poverty engenders suffering, it also engenders crime. If poverty leads to the hospital, it leads to the hulks also. Poverty makes slaves, and, for the most part, thieves, assassins, and prostitutes.' —(Organisation of Labour.) It is not possible, and still less desirable, to recast human nature, especially the nobler specimens, to suit a pernicious system of society ; so we must, if harmony and happiness are ever to exist for our race, recast and adapt that human system of society to our nature.

We found in what the bright side society presented, it drew principally and almost exclusively of human and

external nature ; it is here we find the rich and poor have an everlasting source of comfort and enjoyment, as lasting as it is pure, and varied to the varied capacities of all. The dark side we find entirely founded on human error and action—not human nature—but that offspring or production of our race for which we are responsible, and in which we are voluntary agents. This is our chief consolation and hope, because we may yet change our course, draw better institutions and conduct from the pure fountain of truth—Nature itself.

END OF PART FIRST.



PART SECOND.

NATURAL SOCIETY.

CHAPTER I.

FOUNDATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY.

WE have no right to suppose otherwise than that a natural or perfectly truthful constitution of society is possible, wherein all the virtues are called forth and developed, the tendencies to vice repressed, and the general result happiness. To suppose this impossible seems to cast unworthy reflections on the source of all that is perfect in ourselves, the world in which we live, and the relation between them.

We are perfectly aware that the present common custom is to patch up, add to, or take from, what is apparently most faulty in human institutions, because such is felt most necessary in the common suffering, without interfering with any fundamental principle. This mode we reject, for experience has proved its general worthlessness, and in its stead we seek only for what is true, and adopt it, as the only reliable ground, either for belief or practice.

This subject evidently divides itself into three branches

—first, true ideas of ourselves; second, our true relation to each other; and, third, truth in general, in this world or the universe. The third embraces all physical truths not mixed up with man, or man's relation to society, and which we may discard, as not intimately connected with the object in hand. The importance of true ideas of ourselves has been readily acknowledged in all ages; but not till the present century has knowledge been attained of sufficient data to justify the appellation of science, both in regard to our physical and functional constitution. In the past it was subtle and sublime philosophy; now simple matter-of-fact science, subject to experimental verification. That is, the physical is the substance or material of which we are composed; the functional is the powers and impulses depending on or emanating from the various parts of the physical. From the prominent organs, with their functions in the muscles, heart, lungs, &c., to the great collections of more intricate and interesting ones in the head—by their functional terms, seeing, hearing, reflection, benevolence, combativeness, &c., &c.—variation is the rule; and the minute and delicate nature of the one, or the strong and powerful nature of the other, interferes not with the absolute certainty of every organ having its functions to perform, and no power or function without an organ. They are not only essentially connected, but they are unknown to be apart from each other, and are of equal rank, being all, direct from the source, superior to all that is human; influenced and affected by voluntary actions, yet remaining in their nature superior. We know

many conditions which render the lungs diseased, and we also know many conditions which render the brain diseased; and either of these organs being diseased, the functional duties not being properly performed arrests our attention, evidently with the purpose to modify the conditions, to effect an action in harmony with the destiny of the organ; this done, the organ again performs its legitimate function. For those who cannot well conceive man, in his natural organisation, to be of an infinitely superior kind, we will reduce it to a syllogism—

God's works are perfect;
Mankind are works of God;
Therefore mankind are perfect.

This alludes wholly to man as a natural organism or being; the truth or falsehood he may have acquired, the noble or ignoble he may have recorded, are not to be connected with his being, physical and functional, simply for this reason—the difference between our nature and our thought or action is infinite; the one is derived from superior power, the other is the action of limited power. Our nature is essentially divine, both physical and functional, but our acquired knowledge and our physical action, although grafted on, or rather emanating out of nature, are so much the work of voluntary power within us, that this voluntary power, which we may rationally glory in, must be in its artificial nature pure, generous, and ingenuous, while we, on the other hand, as rightly confess with shame all actions which are dastardly, impure, and criminal. Here we have the responsibility of man, that which redounds to his glory or shame, and

which is essentially of an artificial nature, as all human power, or that of other created beings, must necessarily be limited both in kind and degree. Who has not been charmed with harmonious music? or heard of, if not seen, the Pyramids of Egypt? The one is transient as the shadow, the other is emblematic of the most permanent human power—the two extremes of the kind of artificial or human power. The degrees of this same power are in knowledge, beginning with ourselves and surroundings in the concrete, extending to a great length, yet limited, and beyond where we stop is the infinite to us. This limit and infinite may be innate in ourselves or other things, or in the stupendous material earth or heavens. So physical action and functional power must be viewed as essentially limited, and by their nature artificial, perfectly different from works bearing the stamp of divinity, and impossible to be amalgamated.

Just imagine a poor, degraded, slaved human being, mentally and physically, full of error and the author of many criminal actions—and give Deity the responsibility of the whole! The thing is blasphemous in the extreme. Man must be accountable for the truth or error, the good or bad habits contracted, and, when this is done, the being is the work of Deity. Let those who cannot ensure the destined education of truth and good actions in the developement of human beings put their hands on their mouths on this subject, and rule themselves in their best light. The work must be done, and the sooner the inauguration is the better. Old means cannot effect this, or they would have done so long ago; the intention and en-

deavour have always been to this end, but continual non-success proves the means used to be utterly worthless.

‘Bad passions!’ some person might call out, little thinking that no such things exist. They are a power, like money at present, for good or bad purposes; but our duty is to turn them to the good purposes—and which perhaps can also be done with money—when rendered useless to single individuals. Is love of children not one of the strongest passions? We have seen a child display great pride and selfishness; and in a year or two more scarcely less intense in her devotion to children’s will and pleasure. Every instinct or innate impulse is a passion. It is inexpressibly beautiful that they are so, rubbing each other into brightness and harmony in their natural struggle to development or self-preservation. If there are no bad passions, none but God-created impulses, are we expected to forego secularly all praise and blame—all rewards and punishments? Not entirely, but in a comparatively limited measure; for reason teaches us all actions are necessary, while they indicate the predominance of a certain one or more characteristic impulses. When they chime with our own, no doubt we will enjoy and communicate the community of feeling; or, if they jar with our sense, we will feel offended, and are too apt, perhaps, to communicate that also. They must be in moderation, for no action is without a cause or motive, and we are all too apt to judge hastily of a supposed bad character, and condemn, as if there was no one good impulse; and even so an assumed good character is elevated into a hero and lionised. (See Wilkes in America.)

Good actions are principally their own reward, and this phase is the most pure. Bad actions naturally carry their own punishment with them, and indifferent or trifling ones must be left to find correction by friends or neighbours; but really serious bad ones may be sufficiently important to require interference, either to effect something better, if possible, or, in a possibly extreme case, to treat them as we do the insane—with restraint, but the utmost kindness. It is the moral sentiments that praise and blame moral actions; but there is a managing department, which is named intellect, to restrain or give generous effect to them by the employment of the most powerfully-physical powers. The intellect only weighs these ethereal matters as in a balance; the others are blind impulses without the intellect; but, give thanks, no sane person—no common production—is found without the two or the whole always co-existing.

We are all instruments of equal compass (say of six octaves), varying in power as a whole, or in different parts—some brilliant in the treble, others in the bass, and commonly some redeeming beauty in some part of all; but none more or none less compass, however much distance there exists between them from unfavourable or favourable conditions, and consequently development. No one can suppose that he could have surmounted any bad conditions—any amount of poverty, misery, and ignorance—or acted unselfishly with abundance. No one brought up in good conditions—plenty of necessities, comforts, education, and affection or love—could experience in reality the character produced by the worst conditions.

We are in a world of strict cause and effect; and if you take into account the internal and external causes, you have the key to the whole character produced. The internal includes all fancies and natural impulses, and the external everything that materially affects you; in this sense we are, as the late Robert Owen told us, 'the creatures of circumstances.' No screw is loose, but all absolute certainty in the natural; but in the artificial there is something far wrong, although it alters not in one iota the action of the natural—hence the misery. You cannot stand still long at the sea shore of a rising tide without being wet, forced to retire, or drowned. Even so, if we will act irrationally, we will reap misery; our errors come on our own head, and we are grateful for the uniformity, for in it the future destiny is certain and glorious.

We are thus assured by Nature that by obedience all humanity is capable of being rendered good and happy. When this is not fact or experience, we must suspect ourselves, individually and collectively alone; we are referred to the causes in external circumstances—in human institutions. Nevertheless, we are still believing in artificial punishment, as if human institutions were divine, and the divine human; and it is hard to know what to do with the many matured offenders of the property principle; yet we know punishment only hardens, while duty requires us to use the means of reformation instead of punishment. Punishment, like quack medicine, presumes an immediate cure; but the true medicine effects its cure radically, and in course of time—its name is Truth. Let us not forget, however, that although reason

does not encourage much praise or blame, much less rewards and punishments, our feelings do ; and however strong our convictions may be in the necessity of moderation, our sentiments will always ensure approbation of good, and censure of bad, actions.

Such is the Providence overruling us all, and on which we may calculate, in proportion to the truth of our ideas, with the certainty of uniform natural law. And if we will clearly apprehend our equality as children of superior power, why not live equally children of one family ?—for living in equality is the only practice consistent with the belief of a common nature ; and this does not involve nor necessitate that there should be no systematic arrangement of the labour and business of society. Every person's interest, because common, lies in having the very best organisation ; then why should it not be formed ? We will methodise our remarks by a few divisions :—

THE PRINCIPLE GOVERNING NATURAL SOCIETY.

This principle is simply living in a state of commonwealth and common duties. All have the necessaries and comforts of life in abundance, and are expected to contribute equally to the commonwealth by whatever amount of labour is requisite. To contribute equally is meant by an equal number of hours, in whatever way employed, for the interests of the commonwealth, exception always understood for persons under disease, inability, insanity, &c., &c. This goes on data so radically different from present society, that just inferences are next to impossible for a considerable time after first considera-

tion. We know the objections appearing at first are many in number; the most common one is, that we are not sufficiently inclined to virtue, duty, and justice, as must be required by that state of society. This objection has its foundation in present experience; but this experience is on a totally different data—on the private-property principle. However, this objection will occur very frequently; it is grounded in us from infancy, becomes a habit in our education, and will continue such till it is mastered by repeated conceptions of the absolutely true. We would recommend another syllogism:—

God's works are perfect;

Man's relation to man and external nature is the work of God;

Therefore, man's relation to man and external nature is perfect.

This is the rock of ages on which we stand for human brotherhood, or equal duties and equal rewards, common labour and common enjoyments; and let those who would misrepresent the meaning, and encourage the spirit of persecution against those who hold 'for the truth that will make us free,' not forget that Dick, one of the greatest ornaments of Protestant Christianity, makes community an understood principle in the happy kingdom of the expected future life. His words are:—'*And in those worlds where property is common, and the bounties of the Creator are equally enjoyed by all, there will be no necessity for a law corresponding to the Eighth Commandment.*' It must be kept in mind that the present artificial relations in society are not in nature, but

in opposition to its dictates. Human institutions may exert themselves for a time, but the misery they entail and the lesson they disregard must ensure them of a transitory dominion only ; they are not only not perfect, as they might and ought to be, but it is purely presumption and ignorance that retain them in existence.

This might be illustrated by Pope's 'Whatever is, is right.' Tyranny and injustice, misery and degradation, are right in the natural fact of legitimate effects from human causes, yet human nature repudiates them as right—so does natural truth in the assertion of human nature ; then why do they exist? Just from human error, presumption, and ignorance. This is probably one of the highest lessons in the school of nature, the most difficult to become master of, yet always open to instruction had we but inclined our ears. In a particular case it would be more plain : the skin of our body is cut and no attention given it, for soon festering with uncleanness, the pain involved is right ; it is a lesson, and the mastering of that lesson enables us to save much pain and trouble by proper management of the wound. What is the triumph of the arts of life but the same? To deny that the pain or the tyranny and misery are right, as necessary effects, is asserting that the works of superior power or Deity are faulty, or wrong and imperfect. This would be simply audacious ignorance. It is far more becoming us to accept without doubt, and obey with a strong conviction that the works of Deity are perfect beyond knowledge, and consequently are beautifully adapted for the greatest and most lasting happiness within human

power by their practical application, study, and contemplation.

To simplify the subject of Natural Society, it might be divided into two parts: first, Social Organisation; and, second, Executive Organisation. We would make the latter to be dependent on or emanating out of the former; so we will explain the arrangements of Social Organisation first. The general principle of it is, the production of every comfort of life—forming the whole industry of a community or a nation—will be organised into trades, or departments of labour, no matter whether for the male or female sex, or for both, as the cases may warrant. It is impossible to say without some experience the numbers most convenient for the formation of a community. One may represent a small village and a large extent of landward inhabitants; or, if the town was large, it might be divided into two or more. The proportion of land attached is of slight importance, for, if the inhabitants are not engaged on land, they will on other manufactures, which will be readily exchanged with others wherever that is necessary—in the country or nation, or with other nations.

We will refer by and bye to the value of these exchanges being calculated by hours of labour in their manufacture, but at present go on with the Social Organisation. Every branch or department of industry shall elect and retain its own managers by popular election—or the majority of votes by ballot—among themselves alone for a limited time, subject to re-election, and also subject to dismissal by the same authority and same

means. There is great economy in large operations ; and, where they are large, one manager would, perhaps, be insufficient, so a sub-manager could always be kept for present help and promotion when thought proper. Their duties are the management of the trade, and also keeping the books, what is taken in, given out, and the labour on every article produced. These managers have all liberty, either for more supervision, or for taking part in the necessary labour going forward, just as circumstances seem to them to require ; but their time must be included in the value of the production. They may hear and judge in disputes of those under them, subject to appeal, and will be expected to keep the books also in the leisure hours. These will not be difficult, and will form the material hold they have on the public for some extra consideration and honour.

To produce abundance is of first importance, and to procure the reduction of hours for necessary labour is of next importance. But the natural working of this system will settle that question ; somewhat over production will be followed by more leisure hours, and scarcity by the increase of necessary labour. All productions will be approximately known, and the probable demand the same—both public. There may be variations, but any great famine or waste is most unlikely. These remarks extend to all branches of industry—female ones as well as those of the male sex—in the distribution as well as production of wealth ; the same organisation, although different duties, may be observed. Every member of a community must be employed, and many shall learn more than one

business, on purpose to take to the one while the other is not requisite or over-supplied ; and there need be no restraint for industrial members being retained under any particular manager or department. We know change both to be good for the individual and the emulation of production, so the utmost liberty is accorded to all so long as their conduct is not assimilated to the insane, or the more exceptional—the fiendish.

So much for the principle of the Social Organisation ; now for the Executive :—

1. Industrial Workers and Managers.
2. Common Council of Managers—choosing the Justices.
3. National Assembly—forming honorary Managers of National Works, and the Directors of what shall be executed.
4. The reigning Queen or King, with a House of Councillors.
—These will represent our national hospitality to foreign Princes, Emperors, Kings, and Queens.

1. The industrial members form the basis of all community and consequently national power, and the more who take part in its exercise the broader must be the foundation. We are not favourable to mob law or rowdyism, nor slave or serf law ; they are from egotism in ignorance and despotism, and the more powerful and outrageous from the stimulating influences of the property principle, where alone they can flourish. Very different it is where no selfish interest can form a motive of action—no paid disturbers of the peace, and no hope of personal aggrandisement nor nepotism. Well, we allow every person able and willing to vote, above twenty years of age, the privilege of balloting for their immediate executive servants, whom we call managers.

2. The whole managers of a community—say thirty-six—form the Common Council, and these choose three from among themselves as Justices, one every year, and another retiring, while always subject to be re-elected, and their election rescinded, if either seemed desirable. The meeting of the whole Managers may be frequent as occasion requires, called by either of the Justices, forming committees for special objects, and the majority ruling in every important step. Those appointed as Justices may require Assistant-Justices to free them of too many calls on their leisure time, and the Common Council will confirm or not their choice. The special duties of Justices include all the business belonging to the community as a whole—hearing and acting as arbitrators in any dispute appealed from the judgment of any of the Managers, and subject to appeal to the whole Common Council; and also in all cases not connected with industrial occupation—keeping books of trading, production, and the results of Managers' calculations and employees, also the registering of births, deaths, and marriages—everything connected to the community as a community; and every one is entirely independent, or more properly its one sovereignty, the same as individuals enjoy in the personal. Internal affairs cannot be interfered with from without; but an expedient, if not absolutely necessary, connection in the formation of national union may be formed for national purposes. This must be necessary till nations also agree to become *one* Power; then defence will be unnecessary, abuse of power unknown.

3. The National Assembly will be chosen from among

the Justices, and one shall be sent from every six communities, of say four thousand each ; one of the eighteen Justices will be chosen by themselves, and by balloting, of course, for the national service. We need fear no corruption, because selfish interests are totally repressed in the foundation of the community principle. Their duties are to agree together as to what national works shall be carried on ; what national movements shall be carried forward ; and also as honorary managers of these works and movements, assisting or overseeing as they think fit and find time. None are admitted to idleness entirely ; if there is no important head-work to be performed in the labour hours, they are expected to engage in some common labour. Their election is subject to be rescinded, its duration for three years, and re-election possible. The employments for national work will be similar to common industrial associations, with the Assembly to manage and direct the whole.

4. One other National Assembly, with its head made necessary by circumstances, and our digest of a possible constitution in Natural Society will be finished. The Royal Assembly shall have the reigning sovereign as its head, and the members chosen by the same. The duties will be light, and principally for national correspondence with the sovereign heads of other nations. They may see fit to organise the Assembly to many good purposes, and they will be most welcome. They will receive and treat with hospitality the Princes, Emperors, Kings, and Queens of other nations who come into this kingdom.

Such is simply the principle of community ; for, after

all, it is this principle of co-operation or associating interests which carries within itself the unspeakable good it would assure us all. Community ensures every person of an ample share of natural wealth, and also of wealth produced by the labour of man ; this is the foundation of all artificial wants. The rent and interest of present society are secondary, but yet of great importance, and are made in Natural Society common, and are permanent good for all. It equalises all burdens—in supporting the sick, infirm old, and children. It renders the great probability of every person being honest and true, for it establishes the necessity for these qualities, and destroys the tendencies to their subversion as existing in present society. The unpleasant position of creditor and bankrupt are impossible ; and, in their place, we are associated in reality by social position as well as by nature—brethren of one family. It is the perfect type of economy by association and co-operation or division of labour—that principle which has effected so much for us in Britain, and evidently extending itself of late to poor persons as well as the rich. It is a power which we may appreciate by experience. Great undertakings are rare from individual efforts alone ; but too many of these have but one object in view—wealth, for selfish purposes alone. Its power for happiness has yet to come, and it will prove itself grander than we could have expected ; at present this power can but affect our happiness indirectly, and directly—misery.

This principle of community has its whole support in our own human nature—not on man's works, but on his

nature ; and we know human nature to be divine. We are required to trust in God ; its manifestation must be in the visible—in reliance on divine works, and the human stand at their head. Love in the same manner : those who love their brother whom they have seen, may love God ; but talk not of love to the Infinite while your breast is full of indifference or hatred to one of your race. Reason, the highest function in our nature, advocates for community ; reason is a part of our nature, hence community is of the divine. Happiness, the grandest result in our nature, has its hopes founded in, and its fervent prayer for, community ; happiness is also nature, and divine. Man's greatest power and honour is in doing what nature requires of him—it is in obedience ; and this also is his greatest joy and happiness. Just imagine what the community principle would effect in regard to chattel slavery and barbarian ignorance in the great majority of the earth. The slaves' chains would fall to the ground, and we could take either the slave or the ignorant by the hand in love to teach them for their own advantage. No longer seeking the greatest amount of wealth out of them, while disregarding their degradation, for such interests are annihilated ; but, like Penn and his band of Quakers, although from less power of virtue, treat the wild and unsophisticated brethren with generosity and consideration. This would be a life worth living—very different from selfish accumulation. Community insures no inanimate life ; it is desired by none, although not uncommon at present. Had we ourselves conquered to the truth, there are other nations to be enlightened

and benefited. We at present go to the heathen, and they point with scorn to our failings and vices: our material power is the principal superiority.

We now enter on a few particulars, to exhibit, were it possible, the two systems together for comparison. For this purpose, some of the most important features in human institutions will be introduced. They are:—

1. Constitution and Law.
2. Labour.
3. Common Necessaries and Comforts.
4. Happiness, Health, and Good-will.
5. Education.
6. Marriage.
7. Death.

I.—CONSTITUTION AND LAW.

We will dispose of Law first, although it rests principally on the constitution. There are such a mass of Laws in present society, totally unnecessary in natural society, that our first impulse is to repudiate the whole—in their place relying on education and morality, public opinion, and the absence of external influences for evil, to prevent any gross misconduct. We will better have a clean sheet of paper and transcribe any laws at present existing, which may be viewed as in some degree assisting the judgment of Justices. But the grand idea of Law in Natural Society is found in human nature itself untrammelled by enactments. The judge can weigh all the circumstances and provocations in a case, whatever they may be; but statute law is like a balance to weigh matter, when we may want to weigh motives and actions, atmospheric air, and even gases. When the Judge tells us in

a case that he knows between the claimants which is right, but which is, according to law, doubtful, we see the superiority of the living law over the dead—rational judgment over statute. This subject would require us to bring forward the monstrous iniquities done under the sanction of law—just as bad as have been done under military or ecclesiastical force. Now, from these we have improved, so let them rest; but barriers, in the name of laws and forced respect for them, still deceive us in their utility; but we are not to canonise this state of things. If laws are really unnecessary in greatly altered circumstances of life, experience must guide men in Natural Society; and any attempt to forestall the natural developement would be worse than useless.

A sensible and intelligent father, in the midst of his family, stands in the position a judge would in Natural Society in regard to the public disputes and misconduct. Does the father require statute law to guide him? Is he, without statute law, incapable of giving judgment? The fact is, we know the power now exercised, and which makes us suspicious to part company with statute law—better now than in the past. We dread any returning to corrupt judges, and more unjust law; but going back is impossible with free, enlightened England. Were we to suspect this, our soul must remain for further development and the consolation of the present constitution. But we have embarked in progress, and progress we must; so silly fears shall not turn the great movement. Besides, do not lose sight of the fact, that Natural Society has, *first*, no necessity for any laws which ex-

clusively relate to property, whether in regard to property itself, thrift, inheritance, forgery, swindling, or bad debts; and, *second*, those of an administrative nature for the collection or distribution of the national revenue.

All these curtailed would considerably simplify the maze in law. Neither would we have laws or rules put forth to regulate moral conduct, for the good reason that moral conduct is not made to rule, but from training in good conditions; so, if moral cultivation is requisite, let us to the work! But do not put people in a straight-jacket, for the very curtailment of liberty will make them burst it open. Give them kindness and forgiveness to the utmost; if it proves the patient is unfit for liberty, then let the kindness continue, but without the liberty.

If we will have laws, let them be short and easily understood, and, in point of number, those of questionable utility carefully avoided. But the ultimate and most perfect state will be without law—that is, human law; the sinking of the human must be accompanied with the rising of divine law, which we all know, or may know, if we could only carry it more fully out. Yet there is no reason of despairing of this, if natural society was once on foot, and its principles in active operation. Never, never will these divine laws be generally practised under the present system; and when they do exist, what human law is necessary?

There is another view we might take, in common or unwritten law. Here the judges have established, by the use of the senses, and without statute law, a code of their own common sense. They have existed from time imme-

morial, and legislative power has surprisingly avoided interfering, we suppose from feelings of inability to supersede them with anything equally good and effective. This appears to us preferable to written law for natural society, although it exclusively could never do for the practical operation of the property principle. It is for this statute law is absolutely necessary ; the grasping for property, the ingenious and malicious devices called forth could never be cured by such a mild regimen. Consistent with common law is that of individual rights, which would be respected in natural society.

All the articles which we find have individual claimants in a family, wearing apparel, ornaments, &c., if not absolute right of property, are absolute right of exclusive use. It is puerility to suppose this right can lead to general bargaining—the property principle again. Each has a limited supply, and that supply for consumption or use. If the miser's craving for property in present society is weakness, the same conduct might in natural society be put down as insanity. Collections of natural objects might be prevalent, but innocent are their mutual exchanges, with an entirely different object to the hoarding of wealth. A lady in natural society gets a stamped collar for the asking, and also thread ; she works a beautiful collar—it is hers exclusively by right. A gentleman gets a piece of wood and wire for the asking ; he makes a fancy and elegant bird-cage—it is his, for he has the greatest comparative right to it. And so on ; but this right does not involve the probability that these ornamental works of art should become exclusively used in

private, for the common and nobler ambition is to put our works to the greatest possible utility, which can only be done by getting the public to take them for public service or even exhibition.

Just imagine a grand picture, which has cost a year's assiduous leisure-time labour in production, hung up in the private apartment of the artist! Cases like that might occur, and neither individuals nor society have any right to interfere; but, if the work was of the highest class, the artist will not be possessed of the highest morals to retain it merely for himself. Society would have collections of paintings—every community one at least—and good works of art would be valuable acquisitions to the public. As a gift, it would call forth gratitude and consideration to the donor; while the work will be continually teaching lessons at a glance, and with pleasure, which might otherwise have escaped our attention.

The highest education and employments are made possible by simply applying oneself, without the probability of ruin, as in present society, by such noble pastime pursuits. The idea of trading in such productions is presuming too much on the narrow acquisitiveness engendered by present circumstances in our nature. In Natural Society, there is every likelihood individual trading would be spurned as a corrupt thing of the semi-barbaric past. Mutual gifts and kindnesses might be extremely numerous, but the mercenary spirit condemned to eternal oblivion.

The constitution is to the social working of society

what science is to the steam-engine, or theory is to the practice in any art. The constitution we would recommend is necessarily as yet only theory or science; but the leading principle has been in various degrees reduced to practice, and testifies the latent power for good it carries within itself. It suits not the lover of riches, the selfishly-avaricious, petty tyranny, or the pride of rank; therefore it has been least appreciated where those vicious characteristics are most common; and it has been condemned unheard by professed teachers of the people, too narrow-minded to confess their ignorance, and too dogmatic to see their own prejudice.

We propose to take a few of the modern (comparatively, for they extend beyond the historic period) practical and also theoretic illustrations. The Karens, in Burmah, Hindostan, are thus described:—‘A Karen village contains from thirty to eighty families, and consists almost invariably (in the hilly districts) of one large barrack, built of bamboos, in the form of three sides of a square. The inhabitants are a community among themselves; they weave their own cloth, and are sufficiently skilful blacksmiths to construct all their own tools and implements; they keep vast herds of cattle, and cultivate their fields—no one is allowed to be idle; in fact, a Karen village is a model Phalanstery (a village and land for association of industry according to the ideas of Charles Fourier). Their government is patriarchal, each village having its own chief. They acknowledge no general head, but all the communities are federalised for mutual protection, and in case of war, if a leader is required, he is

selected for the occasion. Their manners are remarkably simple ; the chastity of their women, and the honour in which that sex is held, remind one of the account of the ancient Germans given by Tacitus. They are peaceable and gentle, though they have shown themselves capable of heroism on occasion, and the word of a Karen may generally be trusted.'—Leader.

The reader desirous of many particulars on this subject is recommended to 'Social Systems and Communities,' by the noble and much lamented Mary Hennell, and from whom we purpose culling a few quotations. From the 'Philosophy of History' we find—'Every conquest of the Germans proceeded on the principle of common property. The nation was as one man ; to it every acquisition belonged by the barbarous right of war, and was to be divided amongst its members, that all should still remain a common possession.' The division was every year, and the present German constitution is only a modification of the original one, which was far from being good ; although they held that the earth is common property, association, division of labour, or co-operation for any good purpose was unknown. Robertson, in his account of the North American Indians, remarks that 'they are in a great measure strangers to the idea of property. The forest or hunting-grounds are deemed the property of the tribe, from which it has a title to exclude every rival nation ; but no individual arrogates a right to these in preference to his fellow-citizens. They belong alike to all ; and thither, as to a general and undivided store, all repair in quest of sustenance. The

same principles by which they regulate their chief occupation extend to that which is subordinate. Even agriculture has not introduced among them a complete idea of property. As the men hunt, the women labour together, and, after they have shared the toils of the seed-time, they enjoy the harvest in common. Among some tribes the increase of their cultivated lands is deposited in a public granary, and divided among them at stated times, according to their wants. Among others, though they lay up separate stores, they do not require such an exclusive right of property that they can enjoy superfluity while those around them suffer want. Thus the distinctions arising from the inequality of possessions are unknown. The terms rich and poor enter not into their language, and, being strangers to property, they are unacquainted with what is the great object of laws and policy, as well as,' the historian adds, 'the motive which induced mankind to establish the various arrangements of regular government.'

'People in this state retain a high sense of equality and independence. Wherever the idea of property is not established, there can be no distinction among men but from what arises from personal qualities.' 'There is little political union among them—no visible form of government. Every one seems to enjoy his natural independence entire.' 'But, feeble as is the political tie which binds them, their attachment to the community of which they are members is most powerful.' 'Unaccustomed to any restraint upon his will or actions, he beholds with amazement the inequality of ranks of

civilised life, and considers the voluntary submission of one man to another as a renunciation, no less base than unaccountable, of the first distinction of humanity, whilst he regards his own tribe as best entitled, and most perfectly qualified, to enjoy real happiness.'

We must pass over those of Peru, Mexico, Carribees, and Paraguay. The latter was established in 1580 by the Jesuits, and numbered 300,000 families; and Miss Hennell quotes the Co-operative Magazine for November, 1827, which finishes thus:—'It is lamentable to think that the progress of a state of things so promising of social happiness should have been arrested. The integrity of the Paraguayan commonwealth was destroyed by the cession of a part of the territory to Portugal, and the system introduced by the Jesuits in it has entirely disappeared.' It lasted nearly two hundred years.

The Moravian Society of New England is an interesting illustration, and resembles the primitive monastic life. There are about a dozen societies continually proving the utility of the community principle in America, as the Shakers, Dunkers, Rappites, &c. Miss Martineau is quoted by Miss Hennell, the former having personally visited them, and her experience will be found in her 'Society in America.' She tells us:—'The wealth of the Shakers is not to be attributed to their celibacy. They are receiving a perpetual accession to their numbers from among the "world's people," and these accessions are usually of the most unprofitable kind. Widows with large families of young children are perpetually joining the community, with the view of obtaining a plentiful subsistence with very moderate labour.'

Robert Owen, perhaps, was one of the most illustrious theoretical communists of our own day ; not that he had not practical and successful operations, but that he lived and advocated most conspicuously and beautifully all he professed. The number of theoretical communists of talent, position, and education, we could not think of endeavouring to enumerate. The question must stand on its own merits ; and it is to be hoped neither authorities nor partial illustrations will mislead us. *Experiments of community, where the proper conditions cannot be secured, as in every attempt with individual interests in the members, can only have a very limited success, too limited to be appreciated by those who would oppose all systems of community. If it is to have a fair trial, let the individual property principle be sunk entirely and for ever. Think for a moment of a small community making a commencement : every pennyworth is registered, from the land and houses to the moveable furniture, and all expected or necessitated to be only a moderate success, to give a return of say five per cent. ; at the same time furnishes everything superior to practical members little adapted and entirely untrained for that purpose.

New establishments in common life are often up-hill work. This is just another on a largescale, without giving corresponding duties, nor suffering the self-sacrifice to the manual workers. You see the drain of the per centage pulling it down on the one side, and on the other a superior position is assured without corresponding value from amount of labour. This is at least one half the burdens under which we find ourselves, and expect all

the benefits without the burdens. If it is only co-operative societies for individual interests we want to succeed, they must look only or entirely on the worldly point of view—give no place to anything superior than self-interest; that is, in getting cheaper and better articles for our money, and larger interests than common on the capital. This involves great and sure turn-over of money, and the servants to work rather over than under common hours of labour,* and incessantly hard. But if it is real social reformation that is considered desirable, we must go to the root of the matter, and that is in social equality and organisation of industry.

Both of these are uniformly the ultimate aim of all those reforms which have more than mere political or partial ends in view. Mr Owen, like the great majority of them, shrank from advocating social equality *now*, excepting on experiment, and which can scarcely exist, as we have observed, with powerful influences to counteract its success. Hence Government is so frequently called to assist and carry out the system which individual wealth is unable for. On the experience of a life devoted to the subject, Mr Owen hesitates not to say ‘That the members of any community may by degrees be trained to live without idleness, without poverty, without crime, and without punishment. It is beyond all calculation the interest of every Government to provide that training and that employment; and to provide both is easily practicable.’ ‘It is of little avail to give precept upon precept, and line upon line, unless the means shall also be prepared to train them in good practical habits’ (says Miss Hennell).

It would be easy to give more to the same purpose, and much valuable information on human nature from Mr Owen's works, but we must defer. Neither are we to expect any help or even encouragement from Governments constituted on the present system of society ; they have had more than enough of time for that, were it to occur, but just as soon expect slaveholders to teach their slaves to read and write. Is all reform not from pressure without, and much of the best parts nibbled away in the passing ? Learn by experience, and, if you will hope, hope in self-help or self-reliance in truth carried out by yourselves, and the gradual absorption of the entire people will follow in time.

' Claude Henri, Count de St Simon, was born at Paris in 1760, of an illustrious house, which claimed descent from Charlemagne,' says Miss Hennell ; and a characteristic sentiment in ' Re-organisation of European Society ' is this—' The golden age is not behind but before us ; it consists in the perfection of social order : our fathers have not seen it—our children will realise it ; we must smooth the road for them. All wealth is the wealth of the church ; each profession is a religious function—a grade in the social hierarchy. *To each according to his capacity : to each according to its works.*'

Charles Fourier was one of those rare characters whose life approximated to perfection. His system is somewhat complicated. Here is one specimen :—' Nature is wiser than man ; she does not produce characters in one monotonous mould, such as custom and fashion would dictate ; but she produces such varieties as will form, when united, one

harmonious whole. As with wonderful precision she adjusts the proportion of the sexes, so she adjusts the characters of the individual to the wants of the social regime.' *Attractive Industry—Harmonic Action of the Passions*—is the grand problem with Fourier. We will apply to an American follower (Brisbane) for another sample:—'There can exist but two methods in the exercise of Industry; to wit—the incoherent order or cultivation carried on by isolated families, as we now see it; or the combined order—cultivation by large assemblages—with fixed laws as respects an equitable distribution of profits to each individual, according to the three following qualifications—*Labour, Capital, Talent*. Which of these two methods is the one designed by the Creator? Is it the incoherent or the combined?'

Perhaps no theoretical statement on the subject in hand has been more complete than that by Sir Thomas More, Lord Chancellor of England under Henry VIII., entitled 'Utopia, or the Happy Republic,' a philosophical romance, in two books. It was written in 1516 in Latin; translated into English by Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Sarum. 'Plato's Republic' with it is not to be compared; and these, with many more, must be overlooked till a more convenient and appropriate time.

We have said our say on property in the abstract, or our absolute right over it, and feel no inclination to change; therefore, our use of the word property is for want of a better, and modified in accordance with our views. In this nut-shell of property is the whole question of natural or artificial society. If it is to be Natural

Society, then property to or for individuals is sunk, and the commonwealth is viewed as a part of natural creation, somewhat under our control, and for our living in comfort; if it is to be in artificial organised society, then individual property remains properly as it now exists. Organisation succeeds either, and is false or true according to the first or original start. Unity is the natural effect of the true, disunity or discordance that of the false: happiness and truth are sister and brother; the false and the miserable go together. Shall we choose social peace, or war in ourselves and with our neighbours?

II.—LABOUR.

The greatest institution in Natural Society must be the organisation of labour. This arises from its primary necessity and universality. It will connect all into a brotherhood; it will be the advanced educational establishment for character, calling forth the latent virtues, and repressing the tendency to folly. The censorial power is everywhere, and every person has both duty and interest to help all others to develop and improve themselves. They in return reflect the more light and beauty on all around. Excessive and low-paid labour is a stamp of degradation now; it makes labour repulsive, and has a powerful tendency to domesticated brutalisation.

If we are in darkness, our hope is in the light; if in degradation, let us press to some elevation; if in social chains, let us hope to be free—for all is possible. Even if the body is retained, the mind may rise above the

long-prevailing ignorance and error, and a world of beautiful realisations be created for our successors, if not for ourselves. To be a non-producer—a drone—is now, by some people, looked upon as the only respectable position occupied in society. This would be reversed were labour on its natural and true footing. An able-bodied and healthy man doing nothing to produce wealth, but much to dissipate and consume it, would not in character bear comparison with a common producer of wealth and otherwise similar character. Our whole individual wealth must go for nothing, and our whole individual demands be insured now and for ever.

With God's truth to regulate its amount, kind, and productiveness, Labour is one of the most beneficent blessings necessary for man. It may be a healthful exercise, a pleasant occupation, a duty done most heartily and with a noble pride—a practical action illustrating our love for our neighbours as ourselves. How many noble men have spoken in high terms of Labour? Bemoaners of Labour! Have a care of them, for the fox or the ass make but worthless instructors. Who does not know, as George Combe tells us, 'Wealth can be produced only by labour'? Again, 'In a thoroughly moral and enlightened community, no useful office will be degrading; nor will any be incompatible with the due exercise of the highest faculties of man.'

Carlyle has a high appreciation of Labour:—'Work is of a religious nature; work is of a brave nature, which it is the aim of all religion to be. All work of man is as the swimmer's: a vast ocean threatens to

devour him ; if he front it not bravely, it will keep its word. By incessant wise defiance of it, lusty rebuke, and buffet of it, behold how it royally supports him—bears him as its conqueror along.’ ‘All true work is sacred ; in all true work, were it but true hand-labour, there is something of divineness. Labour, wide as the earth, has its summit in Heaven. Sweat of the brow, and up from that sweat of the brain, sweat of the heart, which includes all Kepler’s calculations, Newton’s meditations, all sciences, all spoken epics, all acted heroisms, martyrdoms—up to that “agony of bloody sweat,” which all men have called divine ! O brother, if this is not “worship,” then I say, the more pity for worship ; for this is the noblest thing yet discovered under God’s sky.’

Take a sample of the more matter-of-fact Barker, when in America :—‘Labour sufficiently hard to wet the brow with sweat is necessary to the health and strength of the body. It is necessary to the health and vigour of the mind. It is necessary to the pleasure of life generally. Those who never work can never be healthy, sane, nor happy. And it is plain that God from the beginning meant man to labour, and to labour hard at times.’ Labour, then, we may rest assured, is a normal condition in life, and its devolving on us all as a common duty is quite sufficient to cause us to make it as pleasant and healthy as possible, and accept it, if other conditions permit, as a noble prerogative. And now we may enter into some details of the ‘Organisation of Labour’ in Natural Society ; in artificial society it is unworthy

the name of organisation, for it is capital and not man that organises, and it is also capitalists and not the men who labour that reap the permanent products. Yet these permanent products must be made equally subservient to the labourer. They must be common benefits when there exists truth in the organisation of labour.

In Natural Society the organisation of industry is very simple, because there is but one interest throughout the whole, and that can with every confidence be left to those engaged, each in his own department. The whole necessary work of society will naturally be done to the best advantage, in the greatest quantity of the best products possible, at the least expenditure of human toil. To make every employment of a healthy character would be one of the first things seen to, because the health and life of man is of much more importance than a few hours, months, or weeks' labour, to render the unwholesome conditions many trades are carried on in fit for healthy existence.

With common interests, it is easily seen overproduction can only be counteracted by deducting from the hours of labour, and under-production by their increase, our necessities and comforts regulating our hours of necessary labour. Two hours each day are not uncommonly named as sufficient, with the enormous productive powers now at our command, if every one able and willing was to engage in that necessary labour—the larger part of the day falling under the head of leisure time, perhaps with an hour or two excepted, by being devoted to some accepted public service; and this large amount

of leisure time is one of the many conditions necessary in the elevation of all in character and intelligence.

The richest collections of natural objects from the animated and inanimated kingdoms may now be within our reach; but of what worth are they to one who has been accustomed, and is yet necessitated, to toil ten, twelve, or fourteen hours each day? But give him twelve leisure hours daily, and these accessory conditions will be duly taken advantage of to the accomplishment of the desired effect. We do not now propose any number of hours' labour daily—that may be done yet; at the present time, it is enough to see how the hours of labour shall be in accordance with our intrinsic demands, and, as a general condition, everything in utmost abundance.

We have a manager or managers at the head of every workshop, factory, or division of industry. These must employ considerable numbers, for this accelerates production, and renders work light and agreeable; and if necessity should require small establishments, they can be arranged by the necessities of the cases, if not amalgamated to some other branch with which they have the nearest business connection. It was said before that the managers kept the books, each of his own department; and not only the articles taken in, manufactured, and sent out, but their value at both times is kept, and that value must be in labour bestowed on the articles. Thus, one hundred quarters of wheat have required three thousand seven hundred and forty-four hours' labour; were it made into flour, a given addition is added, and in all exchanges the labour bestowed is the value in every in-

stance. The raw material so much, the manufacture so much, the waste of machinery so much, and the transmission so much; total, the value of the manufactured article where it is desired and necessary.

Things are not exchanged at an advantage or profit, but at the nearest possible calculation of their real value. Thus an inland district shall give the product of a thousand hours labour in grain for an equal amount of time-value of town manufactures, or fish, or foreign produce—anything that is required and can conveniently be exchanged. Time of labour in exchange for time of labour always, for this only can properly be a subject of exchange among brethren in equality; every district, and if possible the whole country, to have one uniform amount of time for toil per day. Poor crops in rural districts would thus have the effect thrown equally on all by giving the produce the greater value; and abundant harvests the reverse, by giving little value to any given amount of produce, so that town and country will equally enjoy nature's blessings.

Another leading principle of Natural Society will be emulation. It is natural to us under all circumstances, but in Natural Society it will be prominent, for workers will zealously engage to surpass each other in quantity and quality of work, and managers will do the same in comparing with other managers in the same productions, in the cost of the amount of labour in articles manufactured—the best and largest quantity of any given commodity produced at the most pleasant and smallest expense of time or toil. If one of the managers of the

building trades can put a house up at the value of twelve thousand hours' labour, equal in every respect to that of another manager who finds the value to be eighteen thousand hours, in the former you will see that activity and capacity will have its proper reward, and the latter will bestir himself, by force of emulation, to renewed endeavours, or resign to some more competent person.

In every department the same principle will be in activity, every worker taking an interest in the activity and capacity of the whole party in immediate connection, so that the right person, as manager, will be inevitably found. The Justices may decide to what extent any particular branch of work shall be extended or decreased, but if anything of paramount importance is projected, the whole Common Council may take a vote on the question ; thus they will take the responsibility off the shoulders of the Justices. It is with this Council, and the Justices in particular, the knowledge and duty rests of regulating the supply to the demand ; they give the orders, and the managers, with their assistants, take the responsibility of their execution.

We all know how inefficiently and clumsily supply and demand are regulated at present, and the past was still worse ; but in Natural Society they will be known almost exactly, and regulated to the common interest. We must have no such thing as being idle when able to work, nor forced to work when unable from sickness or old age ; but were demand to slacken in one branch, the Justices must be aware of some other department to employ them, for if this is not to be had readily, the conclusion is ob-

vious—the hours of labour will stand further reduction. We at present lament want of labour because it brings poverty and distress; in Natural Society we rejoice in this, because it brings more leisure time! Yet everything is reversed at present, so we need not take notice of this particularly. Is there some pressing work on hand—the harvest, additional buildings, or other manufacture—the supply of hands are short, then an extra hour for toil or labour, if other hands, where they could be spared, could not overtake the pressure.

We must mention—for overlooking is next to impossible—the necessity in Natural Society of organisation of labour among the female sex of our community. Present society cannot well command division of labour here in domestic concerns; but Natural Society makes the path smooth for as perfect an application of this principle as any other department of industry. In washing, for instance, they shall have an appropriate establishment; everything on a large and commodious scale; a drying-house attached, where artificial heat could be applied when necessary by the common unfavourable weather in this climate; the hours of labour the same as all other industrial workers; and one party could relieve another, when the establishments were few, and the hands many in proportion. The other departments of female domestic labour must come under the same principle, and the females themselves must be the best judges of what shall form their peculiar industrial departments.

The changing occasionally from one branch to another

is no less agreeable to some individuals than necessary to the common interest. There will be a vast economy and surplus of labour among the females, and no less vast a change from bondage to freedom for them in the adoption of Natural Society. One woman preparing only her own and another's dinner, or washing her own and another's washing, gives no scope for division of labour; indeed, forces the employment to be of a kind the most rude and unpleasant. The employment of machinery, or improvements on such a trifling scale, is out of the question, and the work can neither be satisfactory nor economical.

We all like to see great results from our individual efforts, whether united with others or single; but here there is a world of care and toil, and for what? It is a common remark that those females brought up to one department of industry—in a factory, a spinning mill, a railway station office, a dressmaking establishment—any but that of housekeeping—make bad wives; yet every improvement in society tends in this same direction—to make young women whose parents are unable to support them in something next to idleness to take to some division of labour for a livelihood, and which deprives them of the experience and habits desirable for wives. In Natural Society this is changed, for the wife, when able to work, may do so even as her husband; but it is desirable, and cannot be overlooked, that her education when in her youth should be in a great degree in the direction her ultimately changed circumstances will require.

The Gru-gru-bush institution of Africa has some com-

mendable features about it, as well as many characteristic of their lowly condition. But no particular institution for female education will be necessary in Natural Society, since the work best adapted for sex and age will, in all probability, be that engaged in, and the education in these conditions cannot be otherwise than superior. So we would expect females to be mostly engaged in domestic work—work in the dwellings of the community, rather than in the workshops.

To give direction to our ideas here, we may state in general terms what might be called a sample of a community. It is composed of two distinct parts—the workshops and factories forming the one, and the other for residences and domestic purposes. The latter have three classes and purposes assigned them, namely—the one extremity exclusively for the unmarried females, and the other extremity exclusively for the unmarried males; the centre for the married, and the apartments of larger construction, for the accommodation of extra numbers. The whole labour of this establishment would probably devolve on the female sex, and, if they were too numerous for it, volunteers for other work would be common and plentiful.

There is no over-fastidious delicacy in the separation of the sexes for the purposes of rest, personal cleanliness, dressing and undressing, and private meditations. Present society cannot admit of this luxury, more from the want of common interests than from mere poverty. Why not condemn customs and habits which bring together under the same roof young and matured women, young

and old men—blood relations they may be or not—living and lodging in private? It is extremely indecent. In these cases there cannot be privacy, nor absolute confidence in respectful treatment for the weaker sex, and the temptations are perhaps equally degrading and corrupting for both sexes.

The cases of peculiar degradation resulting from this proximity are legion ; besides, it isolates us to such a degree that life loses half its relish on the one hand, and increases the temptations in proportion on the other. We have no objection that both sexes of married and unmarried should have the utmost liberty to associate together in the face of day for work, innocent amusement, and wanters for courtship ; but duty asks us to prevent—to annihilate if possible—temptations which are evidently conditions tending to contamination or dishonour. Who that hath seen only a quarter of a century passed could not point to many cases of pitiful, blasted prospects ? The devil, the serpent, or a combination of both, is here sometimes embodied, were we to judge by the effects. This could be all prevented by the change which must in time become necessary, in the establishment of united interests ; and, with these united interests, the degradation of domestic servitude would be superseded by regular work and hours of labour, the same as the other members of the community.

Whatever be the necessary hours of labour, a great surplus of workers will be from this source, not only occasioned by the little work done now, but of its being uncalled for in the new circumstances. It is grievous

even to see men in an everlasting toil, worse than beasts of burden ; but it is more grievous to see young men and women, who have so much to learn, and such animal spirits for enjoyment, never to be out of the harness. Women in particular, without the silver spoon, are under these unfavourable conditions, and women are allowed to have more influence than men over the young, for their physical and mental development. We need not stop to point out the folly and injustice of this ; but take the case of a young married woman. She has had one child, and both are quite well and healthy—the husband has work and good wages, although not able to keep a servant—with little more to do than what belongs to herself. The wife has no time to herself, and may not be at liberty to go a marketing, or cooking, or cleaning, when these duties ought to be gone about ; the house is a permanent nursery, and it would be wonderful did either of the parents relish these conditions—but it must be patiently endured ; and if the wife was to get one day, or even evening or night free from this care, she might be expected to remember it for years.

We may detest the ignorance of the mother who is pleased with the sight of her child one minute or two each day, but we cordially sympathise for those chained to the continual care and trouble from necessity. Would a mother neglect her duty to her child were she to place it with confidence in trustworthy hands, and have an hour or two every day for light recreation ? Could she not relieve others on fitting occasions ? Education—that is, learning to read and write—was at one time commonly

asserted, among a certain class, to utterly destroy the industrious habits of the poor were it given to them ; but the fact has proved the reverse, and so it will be with mothers relieved for an hour or two daily from the everlasting care and toil. The close connection does not necessitate it ; but that forced necessity might receive one half the responsibility of those who lock their children in their house for hours together without any nursing or supervision.

It is not extremely uncommon for women wet-nursing their own children and working a hard day's work at washing, or in a mill or factory, for instance. The injustice is madness, were it not that it is necessity, and not personal power, that perpetrates it ; and who can have the faintest expectation of its cure under the present system of society ? In regard to the hours of necessary labour, it cannot be said people in health are unable to work ten hours each day ; but it may be such are perfectly unnecessary. If they work ten hours from necessity, how long have they for leisure time ?—for leisure time in its variety, and activity or indolence of peculiar adaptation to the individual, is just as much a demand of our innate nature as necessary labour itself.

If we give ten hours to necessary labour, four hours more for meals and purely personal requirements, and another eight hours for rest or sleep, only two remain for a host of other duties. If the workman has a family, what are two hours for his necessary home duties ?—if of a social nature, where go the two hours, to the neglect of every duty ? Two hours at a time might suffice for

reading, drawing, music, studying any one branch of science, but is not enough for amusement—the unbending of the bow, at draughts or chess playing, dancing, quoit-ing, golfing, or cricketing. Now, what are two hours when all these and many more are necessities of leisure-hour pastime? And here we have sunk the duties to the family, to parents, to the public, and to one's self in walking in the pure air for health. What is the result of this toil superseding the pastime which is our birth-right? It is society in its degraded aspect, a Pandemonium—no, that is too strong—but a very general remissness of natural duties, and not less general deprivation of amusement.

Health demands, according to the excellent authority of Dr Combe, two hours each day (not night) for out-of-door exercise and pure air respiration. The same gentleman tells us—'Excessive labour, therefore, cannot fail to prove detrimental to the well-being of the organism, although life may bear up against it for a considerable time.' It eats the soul up in chagrin, cultivates an irritation that gets scope only in privacy, and on those innocent of causing just complaint, never dreaming the true cause to be in the system which is common to all, and much too gigantic for interference by isolated persons. Working men are not alone in long hours of labour, for merchants have equal hours, and an amount of care besides the labour, of which working men have but a slight conception. After necessary labour, excitements of no common kind are requisite to rouse the used-up powers; bad habits are contracted, even before marriage,

which no feminine power can eradicate. On the other hand, other husbands continually sacrifice the same longings for strong excitements, preferring the humbler and nobler one of making home happy.

We need scarcely remark, Natural Society requires no martyrdom of individuals, but rather finds an important duty in seeing all have within reach the greatest possible comforts and natural blessings. And when we think of all having equal hours of labour, it would be characteristic of the individual who was not content. The number of hours daily being so limited or moderate, people would naturally rejoice and feel grateful for the beneficence of nature. Assuredly, her yoke is easy, and her burden is light.

We have said little on the arduous duties of the head, which are not uncommon in present society. They possess the seat of honour next to those who disdain all manual work. Natural Society will expect what of this headwork necessary will be, as far as possible, performed supplementary, and accordingly occupying a position of public honour, either as manager, justice, national representative, or other public appointment of special trust and responsibility. On that work in present society we have M'Culloch quoting Paley:—"We therefore say, with Paley, that "every man has his work. The kind of work varies, and that is all the difference there is. A great deal of labour exists besides that of the hand, many species of industry, besides bodily operation, requiring equal assiduity, more attention, more anxiety. It is not true, therefore, that men of elevated

stations are exempted from work; it is only true that there is assigned to them work of a different kind, whether more easy or pleasant may be questioned, but certainly not less wanted—not less essential to the common good.”

This shows the responsibility of the extreme amount of labour, unconnected with productive industry, on the system of society; and the upholders of the system may take their due share whenever the public demand a change for the better organization of society. It is well known that a large capitalist can take the greatest advantage of division of labour and machinery, and produce articles with a profit, underselling, at the same time, the small capitalists, and driving them out of the market. The strong takes the work of the weak; not unfrequently, the single man will undersell his labour, and secure himself by accepting a smaller means of living than the man with a family can honestly accept to maintain his head above water. These and such as these occur for want of organisation of labour—want of common interests. The isolated state we all occupy, and the competition for the necessities of life, are necessary in the system; but in nature they are not more outrageous to the moral than to the intellectual being of man. Those whose ideas are not further advanced, or who believe we are not advanced sufficient for a change to the better, must protect this isolation and competition; because, with the present constitution of society, they are the best—without them would be retrogression. We must, till ripe for something better, accept of these states of being, al-

though on the forehead of them is seen the unnatural and untruthful.

‘The perfection of manufacturing industry (says Adam Smith), it must be remembered, depends altogether on the division of labour; and the degree to which the division of labour can be introduced into any manufacture is necessarily regulated, as already shown, by the extent of the market.’ Much industrial labour in present society is isolated to such a degree as precludes division of labour altogether; even in manufactures every one is at liberty to push into the trade—dividing the market, ruining themselves, and harming the trade in general. We are trampling or being trampled underfoot by our fellow-beings, and this is called civilisation! Natural Society presents the whole market too full view, can be calculated to a nicety, and organise industry in division of labour for its supply. Labour is pruned of all that is unnecessary, and the benefits are equally divided among all the labourers. Establishments of industry will be on a grand scale, and in due proportion to the demand or market. In this is the greatest economy of labour, by the aid of all necessary machinery and other improvements.

Hear Hugh Miller on labour in present society:—‘A life of toil has, however, its peculiar temptations. When overwrought and in my depressed moods, I learned to regard the ardent spirits of the dram-shops as high luxuries; they gave lightness and energy to both body and mind, and substituted for a state of dulness and gloom one of exhilaration and enjoyment.’ There is a vital

power to that effect which must be, by our superior innate powers, combated and crushed. Perhaps no more effective means could exist than Natural Society. Another phase of his experience in regard to labour:—‘My old inability of pressing for work continued to be as embarrassing as ever.’ Our institutions forced him to think, ‘I was one man too many in the world.’ When suffering like this is made to exist so commonly, so universally, in men no less morally pure than intellectually strong, what can be said in its behalf? or who can stand up in its behalf?

We will introduce Shelley in prose on the subject in hand:—‘There is no real wealth but the labour of man. Were the mountains of gold, and the valleys of silver, the world would not be one grain of corn the richer; no one comfort would be added to the human race. In consequence of our consideration for the precious metals, one man is enabled to heap to himself luxuries at the expense of the necessities of his neighbour—a system admirably fitted to produce all the varieties of disease and crime which never fail to characterise the two extremes of opulence and penury.’ ‘No greater evidence is afforded of the widely extended and radical mistakes of civilised man than this fact: those arts which are essential to his very being are held in the greatest contempt; employments are lucrative in an inverse ratio to their usefulness.’ ‘Labour is required for physical, and leisure for moral improvement; from the former of these advantages the rich, and from the latter the poor, by the inevitable condition of their respective situations, are

precluded. A state which should combine the advantages of both would be subjected to the evils of neither. He that is deficient in firm health or vigorous intellect is but half a man. Hence it follows, that to subject the labouring classes to unnecessary labour is wantonly depriving them of any opportunities of intellectual improvement, and that the rich are heaping up for their own mischief the disease, lassitude, and ennui by which their existence is rendered an intolerable burden.' The difficulty of making common toil attractive is not to be surmounted in present society. The mercenary spirit which necessitates labour to occupy its present position is interwoven with, or part of the system of property itself.

We can never be right till labour—manual, productive labour—is a primary duty, and more respectable than idleness. If there is the least inclination to contempt of labour, a few more words from Hugh Miller might be of service:—'Noble, upright, self-relying toil! Who that knows thy solid worth and value would be ashamed of thy hard hands, and thy soiled vestments, and thy obscure tasks—thy humble cottage, and hard couch, and homely fare! Save for thee and thy lessons, man in society would everywhere sink into a sad compound of the fiend and the wild beast; and this fallen world would be as certainly a moral as a natural wilderness.'

We might attempt an enumeration of the prominent evils in present society, and the benefits in Natural Society, in regard to labour:—

1. Labour in present society is excessive in duration of time.

2. It is very frequently rendered disagreeable for want of proper attention, or outlay of capital to secure personal convenience and health.
3. It must always be a mercenary affair to all those who have not a predominance of superior sentiments.
4. It necessitates extravagance in idleness by want of work, waiting on customers, all marketing, advertising, commercial travelling, and a thousand other unproductive and unenviable toils.
5. It divides us into classes, somehow connected, but from two grand sources—the one from want and toil, the other from the gentle life of wealth and sumptuous living.

The benefits flowing from labour in Natural Society :—

1. Individual and common interest in all production of wealth.
2. Toil will be regulated to demand, and certain to be very limited.
3. Labour must be made attractive ; activity, with comparative lightness, all the conditions to secure productiveness and personal conservation.
4. No master or mistress, and no male or female servants—individual sovereignty.
5. Free of care and consequently free for enjoyment. The necessities of life are guaranteed to all ; and what more is requisite ? *Power* for evil ?—for these necessities include all *power* for good. It cannot be granted, for that is the corner stone that must be overturned to effect any good.

When we conceive of the freedom from poverty in Natural Society, without fear or thought, neither imposition nor theft, neither our own or others' children neglected in education or otherwise, no accidental occurrence can bring a double amount of trouble and hardship to bring premature gray hairs and death to immediate connections ;

these and such as these clear off the great troubles of life, and drinking ardent spirits 'to drive dull care away' is unnecessary, as well as innumerable small actions which make home, in present society, a receptacle of spleen and ill-humour. In Natural Society, to accomplish common labour is simple duty, but to increase that labour for the public service is an honour. No occasion for gold lace and rich food ; far purer and richer rewards are in public respect, esteem, and the consciousness of having done useful and good actions. Could we not divide labour to the strong and to the weak, to the thoughtless and the thoughtful, to the novice and the experienced? Light and simple work in youth ; in maturity or full age the heaviest and most responsible ; in declining age that which requires experience and thoughtfulness. And in no time of sickness, weakness or disease, could work be required ; but these are incidental—health being the normal and almost permanent condition when we are properly guided and treated.

Were we to follow a life of sensuality, intemperance, or reprehensible conduct, ill-health and disease following, we might expect to find ourselves viewed as a disgrace to the community of which we are members, as well as our common nature. Such suffer from their errors sufficiently—additional punishment we have none to offer ; but cases of this class, in Natural Society, we are strongly convinced, would not only be uncommon but of rare occurrence. Diseases of accidental and hidden origin are naturally subjects of condolence and sympathy ; the utmost consideration and the best treatment would be common to all.

It is with some reluctance we enter on some particulars, as if unnecessarily anticipating or miscalculating what will properly belong to the members of communities ; but we expect to be excused, and will add another here. There will be an annual or frequent vocation for excursions and trips far and near ; and how are they to be effected, relative to labour, in such a systematic state as Natural Society ? The practical answer must be left to the future, yet a few remarks on this may not be out of place. Suppose three hours per day was the labour necessary from each, any extra leisure time could be secured by taking six (less or more) hours' work daily for a fortnight or a month—if a fortnight or a month was the time required—for extra holidays.

The community of which you was a member would give you your required authority, and all requisites would be supplied from those communities in the immediate vicinity of which you was sojourning and travelling, which would be duly kept account of in the usual mode of cost value in labour. If going out of the system of communities, recourse must be had to supply the money in use, for there propably will be no medium between coin currency and pure community ; in that case gold will be required, and is very convenient in serving the purpose.

More in his Utopia makes the traveller engage in his trade wherever he goes, so that no account between them would be necessary. After three hours' labour, the leisure time would be used in acquiring whatever was thought most desirable ; but travelling is, perhaps, work enough, and requires all our energy in the aims and ob-

jects in view without necessary work. It is not commonly desirable to be ever on the move; home has a much larger and stronger hold of us than travel; and experience tells us the latter is not to be looked on as a certain pleasure; rather in the imagination than in reality do we find in it unvarying enjoyment.

III.—COMMON NECESSARIES AND COMFORTS.

It is human nature to rebel at any proposal which involves positive change in accustomed usages; still, when a change is necessary for a great and desirable end, we are ever referred to the necessity of the change from the nature of the circumstances. It is the only solution possible, and to defer is simply keeping the sore open; hence the justification of a radical change in one of our most cherished domestic customs. The idea of community in the public mind is essentially connected with common tables for meals, as represented in the communion table, emblematical of the practice of the first Christians; but this is carried too far—at least the conventional stiffness is out of the question, and the absolute necessity of its universal adoption in Natural Society is pure bosh.

In the good artificial circumstances of Natural Society we must trust more to each other's prudence—we must have confidence in each other's rationality. There is a necessity for some amount of prudence and rationality, which we expect is generally possessed, although not at present much cultivated, and the power expected is neither extensive nor dangerous to others, while it is subject to be called in question were it the least imprudent

or irrational. The Spartans were jealous of absenteeism from the common tables, but their republic was only partially a commonwealth, and hence the occasion of jealousy ; the evil power of individual interests, which was the cause, was the same which ultimately overthrew the republic.

There is abundance of everything necessary in Natural Society before us ; excess is a specious and plausible objection at first, though only immediately below the surface it is unworthy rational beings. Starved beings, when introduced to plenty, will for a short time go deep into the necessities, but they become filled and satisfied in body and blood, and then they become quite respectable at meals. As a general rule, food must be taken in proportion to physical exertion ; much less or more, in quantity or quality, is deleterious to present happiness and future health. Thus nature regulates on the one hand, and it is for those who present supplies to have given limits in regulating on the other. If you go into an eating-house of any considerable town, you may have ' a small plate ' of meat, or one larger if only asked for as ' a plate,' and if you add ' a large plate of meat,' you will have three sizes to choose from ; and surely this might be without envy or quarrel, since each can have that most suitable for his present need, and, whatever be the demand, each may be equally satisfied.

Allowing this common sense arrangement to pass, let us see how it can be practised either at a common table or in a private room. There can be little doubt that common tables will have the patronage of the majority,

for reasons which co-exist with our nature. We are naturally social beings, and much enjoyment may be expected where a few friends, say a dozen, are assembled together at a meal. They all are served by waiters according to orders ; for it appears preferable to the common custom at public dinner parties of the present day, where one carves who cannot, and an uncomfortable confusion reigns. The kitchen is not far distant from the common tables, and smaller apartments branch off for the accommodation of various numbers who prefer the company of friends only, or absolute seclusion (why not?). All may be served in the society they prefer with the desired quantity and kind of food ; but the use of these rooms for continuous drinking or eating by one party could not be tolerated—would not be served, did they demand it. Meals are necessary in social arrangements ; but it is absolute demoralisation of our appetites to make such a work of hours. Refreshments from drinks may be good when absolutely necessary in peculiar circumstances, where proper food cannot be supplied or cannot be taken for want of time ; but these are so much in the exception as to lose all value in our consideration, and hence regular meals ought to supply the whole sustenance required.

Gluttony and jollification are repugnant to sense, reason, decency, and respectability ; and unnecessary eating and drinking, called refreshments, are customs which must be consigned to oblivion. They may have roots in benevolence and necessity in timely support at present, but the scene is changed in Natural Society,

when a comfortable and nutritious meal is always to be had for the asking. There are great differences of opinion in regard to the use of wines, spirits, &c., &c.; and the present constitution is well adapted, supposing the purse to be always well filled, for each having his peculiar taste, predilection, or prejudice gratified. Fashionable custom cannot guide us except it has more than fashionable custom to support it. Are they to be admitted on the table at meals—or is it to be the pure element only? There will be opposing opinions on this point, and why not have a fair field and no favour to find what customs shall prevail? The best will ultimately and speedily prove victorious. Let each use what seems best, and allow the same privilege to all others admitted to be sane, and the voice of the community will be heard to proclaim what is to be used; weak heads only think of applying force.

We must have liberty to the utmost possible; while giving a preference to pure water, or that with a decoction of tea for ourselves, we dare not deny another his pint or half-pint of porter. The latter shall be pure of ingredients obviously causing thirst; the same in regard to tobacco—and it also will have a fair field to regulate the consumption for each member. All these differences in opinion as to public practical arrangements are subject for the voice of the Common Council, and if need be, to the whole community. Gluttons and drunkards might think this a state suited to gratify their degraded passions, and no doubt if such mis-educated beings are incurable, and are destined to exist as citizens, they may

have their supplies without money, and suppose we say, without stint. If they will excel in abuse of their stomachs, perhaps they may form a beacon to guide others to beware; if they so far lose respect of themselves, it cannot be supposed imperative on others to hold them in high esteem, nor even to abstain from putting a limit to the supply of what shall be abused.

Present society is the parent of those monstrous excesses. This very day, in passing a few men whom we took for bred hecklers, but now labourers, since the heckling trade is now done by machinery, one of them remarked—‘One thing I do see, those who do not drink get on no better than those who do drink.’ It was seconded, but not cordially received. The fact is, more and more care may be expected to be applied in choice of both quantity and quality of all solid and liquid food, which necessarily changes with circumstances within given limits.

It appears frivolous that any serious objection can be taken to community in regard to common tables, leaving out the assurance of private rooms for those who desire them, since all public dinners are common tables—and surely we are sane enough not to exclude women. In the army and navy they are in considerable practice; in Buckingham Palace the common tables are extensive; indeed, wherever circumstances admit, the common tables are had recourse to; but when isolation of each family and individual is so complete as in present society, there is little chance of the convenience and sociality of congregating together for meals. The common ‘ordinaries’

at inns or public-houses, at so much each person, are common tables. If we have a few friends or guests at a meal, there we see a similar approximation to the same practice. Who would think of making two dinner tables where one could conveniently be enjoyed, the parties being associable as equals?

The individualised state of society at present, however, is apt to warp our ideas to the prejudice of common tables for food. Perhaps seldom or never out of our own house for our meals, a repugnance may be acquired to eat and drink with a few other persons; and even in our own house, if a servant or servants are employed, the customs of society, from barbaric origin, require the division of the small number into the 'family' and the 'servants' tables.

Equality of our race is an acknowledged fact; but wealth steps in and gives an artificial inequality which supersedes the acknowledged fact—hence the division in practice. Between this practical inequality—call it of rank—and the individuals being thoroughly isolated in interests, the great majority are perfectly debarred that sociality which is so universally desirable and agreeable. The economy of such arrangements is very prominent, so much so as to require but few references to particulars. Present society cannot generally apply division of labour in the operations that come almost exclusively into the domestic circle. One person's duty is to cook for two or a dozen persons, while with the natural organisation of labour one person might cook for an hundred or more, and the work made lighter as all work is by the improved

use of the arts; thus the saving is very great. And if we take the many who cook, but are entirely unfit from ignorance of the art—they may have many other duties, and all too apt to be somewhat overlooked by their apparent insignificance—we will find their services very expensive in the indifferent character of the meals produced.

Natural Society is the reverse of this. By the simple power of unity of wealth and interests, the cooking and serving of meals would form branches of industry, and would have the benefit of large experience and perfect appliances and organisation; the products must be creditable, for the honour of the trade and the liability to public censure. Hence we can with certainty anticipate for the many greatly improved meals in all that ensures them of being digestible, palatable, and nutritious, for managers in this, as in every other department of industry, must be alive to the science and art of the trade of which they are at the head. Whether male or female, or both, they must be conversant with the duties of their work; and we all know that such persons can produce a better article and at less expense of labour than another whose duties are innumerable.

The common and generous custom of giving refreshments to visitors will probably fall into disuse in Natural Society, and indulging unnecessarily in the accompanying drink, spirituous liquors or others, shall have the same fate; nor can it be deplored, since the good that might arise out of the custom is better supplied at any of the common refreshment-rooms by a substantial meal. Besides, people are pressed to eat and drink by friends,

and do it when neither hungry nor thirsty, for the refusal, however proper, is too like positive stinginess ; on the other hand, compliance involves in appearance friendship. The custom has established a duty to press hospitality and also to accept it : it has already outlived its utility. We have lately had too much eating and drinking for pleasure when eating and drinking was uncalled for ; friends on these occasions, in Natural Society, shewing the same feelings, which are essentially generous, must engage each other in more pure and elevating occupations.

How would Natural Society accommodate itself for the clothing of its members ? In answering this question, of course it must be kept in mind that each community will judge and regulate its own affairs ; and our remarks will be taken as an imperfect attempt to forestall its natural action, for those who may not have thought on the subject. It is a very vulgar idea to suppose that, because we do not hold anything as private property, we should not be long in possession of even an article of dress, or other thing peculiarly related to the person, when it might or would be laid hold of by another. They will have anarchy with community who will believe this appropriating conduct. If we are assured of abundance, and in possession of abundance, why should larceny be of common occurrence ?

As all our new ideas are apt to be influenced by principles and opinions held from our childhood, so these vulgar suppositions blend the old ideas of property with the new ideas of common interests, when they naturally

will neither mix nor co-exist. Natural Society produces clothes, as every other product, by the adoption of the most complete organisation, and all the most productive accessories of improvements and machinery at our command, and their distribution might be periodically or simply applied for when wanted. It would be curious information to know if the one mode had any advantage over the other. Were they supplied on application, they will equally be kept account of, seeing how consumption is proportioned to the numbers of the members.

Abundance is a first condition in Natural Society for all the necessities of life, clothes included. They are even so in our present state; but the condition that keeps the poor in rags shall be annihilated in Natural Society. No more bickering and lying about the price—they are there ready when required. If we will use those of great labour in proportion to the wear, we know it will influence our hours of labour, so we may give in labour extravagantly to take clothes of extravagant manufacture. We reap as we sow, and cheap when it is so; but it might be questioned if the trade in present society does not stimulate to an unwholesome extent the changes in our garments, called fashions; and, in regard to quality, there is but a secondary interest, so that appearances exist to insure a quick sale or return.

That a shoemaker should fret that a customer returns too early with another order, or a draper feel irritated by the demand for another suit of clothes from a previous suit going to ribbons or prematurely shabby—these, in present society, must be held for what they are worth,

and probably they would be endured with secret elation ; a good-paying customer would receive marked attention to make up for deficiency in quality. This could not take place in Natural Society, for workmen are responsible for the quality of their work, and managers to the public for the manufactures produced. The marked attention of the shopman is not the thing for Natural Society ; but a consciousness of having fulfilled our duty gives an independence, and the invariable civility of properly-matured men gives an urbanity which renders the recipient above vulgar hypocrisy. Yet, in present society, it is so common, that it would be severe to rate it at its normal value ; some men believe they pay for the becking and howing of hotel waiters.

The actual opposition of interests is the distinguishing feature of present society ; and these miserable conditions entirely cease to exist in Natural Society by the absolute union of all interests. There will be emulation, but that condition is necessary and good, in the comparative endeavour for all that is creditable. It is less or more in every department of industry, and the production of cloth or clothes, &c., shall form no exception ; excellence in kind of work or quantity of work will always be commendable, and subjects of emulation. Who would prefer working under one manager who could produce one coat from the cloth per man each day, if, under another manager, with the same hours of labour, two or even three coats could be turned out as well finished for each man's share per day ?

The community must know the average production of

its members, and each department under a manager must have its character marked, if not somewhere about equally productive to other similar departments. The Justices will be responsible that the quantity is always abundant for the necessities of the community. And as females have not shown any decided inclination to official situations, they may still impress their superior knowledge as to female requisites in clothing by voluntary deputations, when there is occasion, to the Justices, who cannot but facilitate the object of the fair sex. If females were much engaged in the production of their own apparel, no doubt the manager would be of their own sex; so the proper understanding between them and the Justices would be complete without any peculiar demand.

Accounts, of course, should be kept of the whole business transacted; each manager has his own department of books. The Justices, keeping the general statements elucidated, the exact average consumption and production can be made public at stated times, and the balance deduced as to the wealth or effects of labour in the community. There may be one or more warehouses of clothes, in proportion to the inhabitants and necessities of the community, to replenish our napery and soft goods of every use. No check can be allowed to interfere between persons requiring articles and their possession; but it is obvious, were flagrant abuse observed, the party would be publicly called to account. Yet, we must trust all in the first place after coming of age—say at sixteen; for absolute abuse of the products of labour is out of natural action—indicative of insanity.

In present society, custom and pride, and other foolish habits, where the power is very extensive, create habits of extravagance, if not absolute abuse ; the supplies are without proportion in abundance, to be hoarded or used for a short time, and given away as presents. Is it better to give than to receive ? or is neither position entirely proper ? Till persons are sixteen, their supplies might be through their managers, whether male or female, for young people might neglect to put a proper value on them, and are frequently ignorant and careless as to how little or much clothing they use.

The earth is said to represent our common mother. Natural Society might represent our parents in the care and guidance it bestows, for it is the intention of Natural Society to present to all its members the whole necessities of life, derived from labour, free as the air we inhale. Use, but no abuse, must be our maxim ; and no doubt we will find it ensure benefits far exceeding the most sanguine expectations.

In regard to house accommodation a few words must be presented. We referred to a community town, with its centre for the married members, its right wing for the daughters, and its left wing for the sons ; the workshops within an easy distance for communication, and sufficiently far to prevent the deprecation of the atmosphere, or annoyance by other effects, to the inmates of the community home. But to descend to particulars in the probable, as to how we would be situated in regard to house accommodation. We would never think of imitating present society, where you will so frequently

find a large house occupied by two or three persons, while another, only one-fourth the size, without any decent conveniences, with its dozens of occupants. When society has gained a perfect union of interests, it would be easy to draw plans for more serviceable houses than we generally behold at present ; but simply using what we have at command, we may leave to the future the consideration for the erection of something better.

For young unmarried persons one good sized bed-room is sufficient ; there are abundance of rooms for all other purposes at the disposal of any and all members of the community. We would always have pleasure in seeing the general wishes carried out, when consistent with the interests of the whole ; and therefore, with many other conditions, those bed-rooms of the unmarried might be kept perfectly private or open, as the occupant would command. We would oppose any general practice of keeping these rooms public when not in accordance with certain individuals' opinions, being applied to them without official authority. Individual sovereignty implies public deference to personal concerns. The probability is they would be left open and unvisited by others than those whose duty would be to see them well aired, cleaned, and the bed made up. Females might or might not do this for themselves ; in course of time probably few or none would do even this, since it would not be better done by themselves, and they would have their peculiar duties the same as men—the same length of time daily at necessary labour, which gives an indifference or aversion to other work than that of virtue—for the love of the

work itself. Virtue is here used in the Italian sense, which includes music, painting—in fact, all the fine arts; and these, with amusements, would diversify, according to inclination, the leisure time.

Married couples could not have less than two or three rooms, with two beds. They, in good health, like the unmarried, would evacuate their apartments to others more suitable for conveniences and comforts during the day. This is just similar to what we practise in present society; but these individual homes are the source of much and great happiness, and also of much and great misery. The former may be yet more and greater, while the latter might be almost annihilated, with the institution of common interests. Absolute seclusion in the leisure hours is as practicable in Natural as in our present false state of society; or, further still, liberty to retire from the community at all times, even to an hermitage if desired, to live the heroism of ignorance and conceit, of narrow-mindedness and want of benevolence and sympathy. The glory of our 'castle' will have departed, when a castle is no longer requisite. Natural Society will not be more preferable than elevated in comparison to the old castle; simply living in peace, pleasure, and unity.

These exquisite feelings, which too many in present society fail to experience, of 'our own fireside,' the family circle round the hearth, where love is common and want unknown—these sentiments of parental regard and mutual kindnesses seen to be spontaneous, which are reviewed again and again in after life with renewed and

augmented delight in the divine kaleidoscope of our mental powers—these domestic associations are not to be interrupted by Natural Society, but rather to be rendered more universal by the assistance of more time and comfortable apartments—altogether, better conditions—without the jarring elements which cause so many quarrels and ill-nature. With the harmonising principle, our natures will work out the rest, for surely blood-relationship is a tie capable of stimulating a particular interest and happiness in each other's company ; and as nothing like overweening self-interest can be dominant, the assembling of families and relatives will receive an impetus which will ensure frequent happy dinner and tea-parties.

Thus, although we may sleep in different houses, work in different shops or places, we are left at liberty and independence in all leisure time and meal hours, when families and relatives may associate to their hearts' contents. In these we have individual sovereignty and voluntary companionship. Necessary mingling of relations is not a probable condition of Natural Society when enmity is mutual, as we find so very frequent in present society. 'Friends are best separated' when ignorance and ill-feeling are common ; yet this is just the contrary of the 'halo of happiness' existing in the domestic circle. The truth is, that in present society a family is reared in too secluded and inflexible conditions, neither seeing and knowing enough of others, nor power to change from among those where respect was non-existing to the company of others where esteem is common. Thus they

are apt either to become too devotedly attached to each other, or they are, by various means and actions peculiar to present society, estranged to such degrees as to annihilate any sympathy that may have existed—yes, lawsuits are not unfrequently family quarrels and animosities.

The houses of the great majority of the middle classes are necessarily extravagant to such a degree as to bear little comparison to Natural Society. Although there be six or seven apartments, only two or three are occupied to the full, except when there is a family, and house room is then increased or enough is not enjoyed. A kitchen for each family, like a servant or servants for each house, is, in regard to economy, extravagance. The sleeping and sitting rooms may not be of this character, but the dining and drawing rooms, superbly furnished for exhibition to friendly visitors. They are also extravagant in a natural sense, because not used to a quarter the extent requisite to make them of utility. Our business accommodation is very similar: the shops and offices of present society would be more profitably employed in Natural Community, because they would be directly engaged in productive arts or other actually and naturally necessary purposes. Where buying and selling are unnecessary, and their consequent book-keeping, the house room used for that purpose may be viewed as not less useless toil in their erection than keeping them in repair. Community of interests produces by toil nothing which is not necessary for society. If it cannot pretend to give palaces to all its members, it assures them of a comfortable accommodation, perfect independence; and neither sex, youth,

nor age, in health, error, or disease, will need to fear the cold blasts of winter.

Natural Society aims at direct accomplishment of the requisites in human life. Our present system is indirect and unjust in the same object. The former promises to comfortably lodge us; the latter leaves us to fight, scramble, and usurp the best we can command. It would be difficult to find a limit to the evils incidental to the house accommodation of the many were we to detail particulars, but a deeply felt phase is indicated of manufacturing villages by the Rev. John Montgomery, quoted by Mr W. Chambers:—‘The inconvenient smallness of the houses; and the few apartments, if indeed there are more than one; the diminutive size of the apartments, sometimes even when there is only one; the want of opportunity of quietness for reading; the impossibility of retirement; the difficulty, not to say impossibility, of maintaining tolerable decency—is it needful to say of what tendency these things are? Can it be wondered at that intellectual progress is so often arrested when attendance at school ceases, that youths lounge idly in the streets, that men take refuge in public-houses, and that other evils ensue?’—P. 3 Building Societies.

IV.—HAPPINESS, HEALTH, AND GOOD WILL.

These, under the general term of happiness, require conditions which are tacitly repudiated as being subjects of responsibility by the representatives of power of present society. However, they involve in reality the grandest and greatest interests that can move us individually or

collectively, and as such belong to our highest duties. They require the necessities of life to be certain to all—all proper liberty and equality, and the full development of our mental powers; on these, and out of these, they exist and emanate. Although happiness is a purely mental condition, it is the blossom of the being, the fruit of the tree. We all love to be happy, and in consequence we esteem those who augment that condition, whether in mechanics—such as Watt and Stevenson, and many others; or in music—such as Handel and Mozart, &c.; or in painting—they are very numerous; we are delighted and love, even although there may be traits in their characters not squaring with our standard. This is happiness through natural sources; but what will be said of that which has wealth as a necessary but uncertain condition, and which exerts a powerful influence over actions in general, and all this influence totally spurious, belonging to the artificially false?

With wealth even in abundance, the heart may or may not be content; generally not, and where, in the greatest degree, we often find the nearest approach to heartlessness. Neither the heart nor intellect can rest satisfied while misery is so prevalent, and especially misery caused from want of the first necessities of life—these things which are so entirely within our control. It cannot be called mismanagement or injustice, although these may be prevalent; error and misdirection, false principle and unnatural institutions, purely the work of man, and on man falls the necessary effects.

We are all members of common humanity; innate

feelings animate all, for the want of exercise in works of utility, for want of a thorough amalgamation in humanity, would under any common spirit, however bolstered up by wealth, subject to heart-ache more miserable than active work and long hours. Active industrial work is an innate passion or want in humanity, and it cannot be evaded without the vacancy being oppressively apparent. The thorough union or brotherhood of humanity is the very same. Isolation, so common in our individualism, is slow murder to the delicate and social spirit. The standard of life's happiness is lowered by want of sympathy, and indifference to each other's trials, only varying a few degrees higher or lower in positive misery. What can wealth do, when every incident known which tells of poverty leading to crime and degradation of our nature is read practically a reprimand for our hoarded and exclusive abundance? But while this is properly so, let not the sons of toil believe themselves in the right when spending all their income, when they might conveniently make a small store for future exigencies, and thereby avoid the temptations of poverty to crime and degradation.

Whether we are rich or poor, our part is to use and not abuse wealth, helping persons and institutions which are known to be good and deserving as far as in our power, thus living and acting in a state of individualism which assimilates itself as far as possible to that of absolute union of interests, however circuitous that mode may be. It is true, community would avoid the poverty and its consequences, its begging and its alms-giving, by the substi-

tution of common duties and rights; but with individualism, poverty must be endured; and absolute starvation, we would flatter ourselves, must not be in existence, to our eternal shame and disgrace. We must just accept poverty with its miseries, and wealth with its miseries, till we can dispense with these distinctions, and act up to our best lights; and, as we have said, this will be but a poor substitute to the principle of common interests. Despondency and recklessness are common causes in landing us into the slough of poverty; they have but one antidote—the endeavour to possess a stock of capital. It may shock generous and thoughtless natures, but it is necessary in the circumstances. The miser and the drunkard or debauchee are the two extremes in the scale: we can dispense with the imprudence of the latter, but a leaf of the miser's bible is of much utility.

Wealth is power—if it is not all-powerful in the unnatural state in which we live and move—and this is why the prudent everywhere endeavour to save a small store for the virtues, not to speak of the first duty, in honesty of life. We do not require purse-pride; but independence of charity and debt, even should circumstances be peculiarly adverse for a time. Yet it is desirable, if it can be got, a position permanent and independent among men—the true and pure emblem and substance of which can only be expected in Natural Society.

However hard we may think our lot, our duty is clearly to keep our character pure and independent of gross personal oppression or tyranny, for in sympathy and consideration of others' rights and pleasure are rooted

those virtues which lead to and ensure happiness for ourselves; for happiness is to our race and all animated beings of the higher orders what the sun is to the world in which we live: without it, life to us is not only a failure, it is the reverse of a blessing; with it, life is in its own peculiar element, even as the blooming vegetation of the fields tells us of their peculiar adaptability for the warmth of the solar rays, each in its normal condition or destiny. Let it always be kept in remembrance that the purest and most lasting happiness is not an object of pursuit, but only a condition of all proper activities—innocent, duteous, virtuous, and noble pursuits. Hence, amusements and comparatively frivolous occupations only give pleasure for the moment—they are characteristically transitory; and activities, where work that is enjoyed indefinitely by ourselves and others, are a continual source of happiness; and by finding out our individual department in these occupations, which are sufficiently numerous, there we may find Nature's genuine blessings, in the learning, execution, and retrospection.

Amusements in youth greatly assist in the healthy developement both of the physical and mental faculties, while the higher objects of life will be undertaken in due time and with greater power; but at all times in life are these light occupations commendable, if time and circumstances permit. Our nature is not so stoical but that novelty or variation of work is desirable. The amount of either kind engaged in shows the predominant bent of natures. The predominant mental organs of which we are in pos-

session in time gives the individual character, which we cannot alter—nor is it desirable that we should greatly interfere. Happiness from impure conduct is just another phase of crime; the consequences which naturally ought to follow, in society's detestation, are not forthcoming at present—and then we find many believing in 'happiness from impure conduct.'

When any qualms of conscience appear in the one balance against a night's revels, called pleasure, we infer the latter to be a mistake. Even were pleasure real for a time, it would be gross error, not at all likely in a sober person and rightly organised state. Community would be as strict to secure personal character for all as the head of a house ought to be over the younger members of the family; and nothing gives better prospects of permanent happiness than irreproachable reputation in either sex. So far from this being probable in present society, we have temptations on every side permanently existing to turn our actions into the paths of vice. We may be told 'honesty is the best policy,' but the precept may be on the lip and the practice very different. Precept cannot compete successfully with the combination of society's temptations in opposition; the innate mental powers are our only support, and they are liable to be deceived and corrupted. In Natural Society the influences of society will harmonise with our innate powers, to the firm establishment of the rational and the pure—the intellect over the passions; and no small power can prevent this harmony.

Relative happiness, in regard to the community or the

public, is not only compatible with utility, but proportionate to the excellent accomplishment of the greatest and highest duties in life ; and this fact, the leading star over individual life, keeping the mental eye aiming at the greatest and noblest actions in our power. All might go on smoothly in Natural Society where no mere external and individual interest would compete with merit, but that those of the highest and fittest abilities would naturally be chosen, and accept with deference, to the work of greatest responsibility. There would be no clashing of motives in self, between duty and self-interest, but only one motive—duty ; and, consequently, what was engaged in would be carried on with ability, and those supporting the managing head being equally in good circumstances, would render the whole management almost incomprehensibly easy and efficient. In such circumstances there is room for happiness—the one class is not oppressed mentally with care and chagrin, the other is not physically with exhaustion ; and, although not to be expected in present society, they exist as part of the rock of ages, to benefit us when we are disposed to take the advantage at our disposal.

Natural Society is enveloped in one word—*truth*. For us, duty requires absolute knowledge of what we call truth ; no mental straining, no blind acceptance, no differential acquiescence ; hence it is at our disposal. This word, broad as the universe—truth, is more than sufficient for us, as the field is larger than our limited senses and knowledge, altogether to infinitude on every side ; so we may speculate and theorise, but only that within

our range known to be absolute and uniform truth are the prepared stones fit for the building up of human happiness, glorious and ultimately universal. What tribute to Deity can equal this desirable consummation? What could so thoroughly curtail or annihilate the victimising proselytism of error? Duties may be apparently humble, and the more congenial to our nature on that account, and beautifully adapted because humble, while not less effectual. Nothing can be more conducive to health, and it is a first condition of happiness.

Health.—Aristocratic ladies are said to affect delicate health (is it not only the hands, or the fox with the sour grapes?), and matches in delusive sentiment may be found to them in other classes who affect to disregard health, and attribute care in its preservation to fastidious conceitedness. The quality of one's garments is no assurance of exemption from gross errors. If a man desires to do his duty, while duties are possible, he must be in good health. What may be the principal duties health involves? First, to avoid giving additional toil to others, not to mention the pain, &c., to ourselves; second, to discharge personal and public duties which are permanently necessary; third, to render assistance in any emergency, and cheer and comfort the lives of all around to our utmost; fourth, to perfect ourselves in character by self-culture, and in which external nature, animate and inanimate, may be so used as to render very great assistance—and the result is perfecting our own happiness.

Perfect health, if possible, is admitted of first importance. Is present society suited to favour its general

prevalence? Ask the miner, the factory or mill-worker, the boot and shoemaker, the tailor, the dressmaker. Ten or more hours daily are each in the strait-jacket assigned them. Can this exist with vigorous health—the foundation of happiness? ‘O, blessed health! thou art above all gold and treasure. ’Tis thou that enlargest the soul, and openest all its powers to receive instruction, and to relish virtue. He that has thee has little more to wish for; he that is so wretched as to want thee wants everything with thee.’—Sterne.

The progress and developement of present society go on giving straiter and straiter jackets, by giving more minute range of activity; and nature seems only to provide one means of escape from the position, and this one is sufficient and essential for health—it is fewer hours of labour. Talk not of Saturday afternoons, taken in quarters of hours off meal times; and less so of half-time and half-pay, running in debt the worker—these are not of any value for the necessary and permanent cure. Then there is heavier work, with some change of action—this is more favourable to health; for if the body has only little action, and this confined to certain parts, other circumstances of atmosphere and constitution being equal, the physical, which includes the mental, goes out of easy working order into ill health. If the principle of division of labour tends thus to render all work of a light kind, superseding physical exertion in a great degree, and yet not contracting the time of necessary labour, what else can be expected than the stunted growth—the puny developement of the people? With this

result, the enjoyment following robust health cannot be known, and life itself is deprived of its primary requirement for the first condition of contentment.

Premature death is a standing evidence of wretched health, and the ignorance in all classes on this subject is by far too prevalent; but every year is bringing the subject more prominently before the public, and nearer the importance it ought to command; yet it is grievous to think that outward circumstances deter us by their force from complying with the dictates of reason, with the conditions absolutely necessary and well known to be efficient for the most desirable object of sound and robust health. As in every part of nature, health is purely a subject of cause and effect.

Dr A. Combe gives us a statement of the maximum thus:—‘The highest health and greatest vigour will always be on the side of those who make the nearest approach to the fulfilment of the organic laws.’ And of health being to man the normal state—the same as the arts, or society, or wisdom, or peace, or truthfulness being natural in the acquisition, and many others which present society has reversed—he says:—‘It cannot be too much impressed upon the mind that health is the natural and intended condition of the human body, and that all deviations from this state must arise from causes having their origin in human ignorance or neglect, disease being the evil consequence attached by an All-wise Creator to wilful or ignorant disregard of those laws which have been established by Him as essential to human health and happiness.’ Yet it must be admitted

how very common it is for people to know what is necessary for the maintenance of health, while our businesses will not admit of us acting in accordance with them.

Only last night we witnessed a case of good evidence to that effect. The party could have lived very comfortably without engaging in business, but a shop for business is persisted in, with the usual waiting on it of twelve or thirteen hours. The length of time in the duties was a bore at the best, and the conditions interfered essentially and grievously with the party's health. This is a common position, and when necessary labour thus prevents good health, is our nature to be changed by unnatural power? or are the external conditions not to be changed to harmonise with our nature in effecting good health? We need not knock our heads against the rock if we want water to flow from it. By quietly learning any given natural subject, you will uniformly find the first step in gaining what is desired; your second will be to act as that learning directs you—absolute obedience; and, lastly, if you have learned and acted right, you will be perfectly successful—that is supposing the subject learned at first had the capabilities required; if not this, then no further action is engaged in.

Then if nature and duty require us to be obedient to action in absolute truth, it is pure folly for necessary labour to render this impossible, but rather to our physical, moral, and intellectual deterioration, if not destruction. The fact is, it is only a question of time when all these artificial obstacles shall be surmounted. Your damp and dirty workshops, noxious and ill-ventilated,

along with every uncongenial condition, must, in as far as possible, be circumscribed. Human existence is of a far higher nature than to be placed in the balance against less or more trouble or labour to place things under our control in the relative positions most fit and proper. But if we will not, as is evident in present society, then the apparent evils of ill health shall be permanent, in all probability. We say apparent evils, because no *thing* is purely evil ; actions and conditions are not even things, and, if called evil, it is relative to ourselves. Perhaps the drunkard calls the headache following his excess an evil ; it is just as justifiable as other acknowledged evils, but from ignorance and disobedience to knowledge.

All evils have perfect cures, if not for us personally, for the members and successors of our family. We find evils, in regard to health, in pain and disease, and are foolishly censorious over them. The neglect of the organism by ourselves, or possibly our nurses or progenitors, either or all was the cause ; and the remedy is by the straight and at present difficult path back in obedience to nature. Physicians are good if required, and excellent frequently, but light and knowledge to doctor one's self is far better. These evils, like every other, are comparable to light-houses in the night-time darkness to mariners tost on the wide ocean, counselling us to steer clear and save ourselves from absolute destruction.

John Sterling says, in writing of Thomas Carlyle—' I find in all my conversations with Carlyle that his fundamental position is the good of evil ; he is for ever quoting Goethe's epigram about the idleness of wishing to

jump off one's own shadow.' Either good or ill health is open to us, and we have only ourselves to please, for Nature's open account with us is 'whatever is, is right;' and the squaring of accounts is the never-failing last act on the stage of life. To comprehend the subject there must be a discrimination in present society, between the conditions of life which are natural and true and those which are artificial and false; if this cannot be done, it is impossible to see 'the good of evil,' or evil's relative position to man.

Cleanliness is one of the most essentially personal conditions of health; and, however simple in appearance, is entirely out of the reach of the great majority, without there is an eminent disposition for that commendable practice. But external conditions must come to favour us to whatever is good and pure; they must be made for us, not us for them; and, if we cannot conform to this, we will less or more be abused and degraded in the utter disregard of natural law, uncleanness included. At present there is neither time, house-room, nor artificial power to defray expenses in the great majority of people. We have paid one shilling and sixpence for a warm bath, and many work a whole day for such a sum. Doing so, how long would it take one, after paying the passing necessities of food, clothing, and lodging, to have the necessary sum for that purpose? or, when this sum was saved from such miserable hardships, is it probable the unfortunate toiler would find a warm bath, even although considered desirable, the most proper outlay of the sum?

Is it not lamentable that present society should render the many commendable practices and attainments almost impossible to the people? On the one hand, there is comparatively no reciprocal benefits from the incoherence of isolation of all in society; and, on the other, the time and expense necessary are not to be expected under the circumstances. The Otaheitians, who are exemplary in cleanliness, bathe in some of the running streams three times each day. Their hours of toil are fractional compared to ours, and the climate with us does not require so frequent ablutions. Besides, our cold atmosphere will not allow us to bathe in the open air except for a few months throughout the year. Hence the necessity for artificial arrangements, and in such it is desirable they should be so entirely free as would admit all to have recourse to them the same as the water which washes our island. It is questionable whether this will ever be accomplished without the services of Natural Society, the circumstances being so entirely changed as to render every valuable opportunity to do what is good free as the sunshine, common as the necessities of life.

The baths and wash-houses, for cleanliness, would be directly the interest of all in society, to prevent disease, or to preserve health, and consequently they would be erected, in all probability, with much taste and excellent convenience, carrying an association of ideas the very reverse of our modern jails, poorhouses, and hospitals, and patronised to a degree never experienced in this part of the world. Personal cleanliness would be found well worth the trouble, in the comfort and vigour imparted

to the system, which is recompense sufficient for the public, who are gifted with many more degrees of common sense than is frequently placed to their credit. The use of the baths being free as the air we breathe, without cost and without question, we have a strong probability of a higher standard of the physical and mental powers, on the one hand, and on the other, as members of a community, the average of the healthy would be greatly increased, and the benefit extended to the public interest.

There are many other departments of cleanliness—such as in all the necessities of life—and there can be no question of Natural Society being to the full as particular as in medium households. Why should they not be more so, when the circumstances shall be a hundred times more favourable? Were cleanliness in Natural Society questionable, it would be known, and this would be the first step to see that the remedy was applied. The cleaning of our dwellings would be effected by regular workers in the ‘division of labour;’ they would guarantee the proper fulfilment of the work assigned. In present society you will find homes clean and dirty to very great extremes, and in all classes; the sanitary laws are sadly neglected in the neighbourhood of some of the wealthiest. In Natural Society the homes and neighbourhoods of all must be efficiently cleansed before we could rest satisfied, because it is now a thing of first importance. We are not engrossed in business, or interested to be quiet, or foolhardy to hope escaping ourselves, whatever shall be the consequences to others.

The thing now is in its natural relation, and must be made right, if it is not, and cannot be too soon.

The same in regard to clean clothing: the economy and ease with which they could be purified would effect an enormous saving of toil, and care, and ill health. Improvements and machinery would be applied with their well-known effect. Just imagine a case of common experience—a woman wet-nursing, and at the same time washing; she is generally confined much to the house, but the drying of the clothes takes her from the steaming position to exposure in the open air, no matter if it is frosty or only a cold wind. What an awful perversion of human power!—what we must endure for our ignorance!—what a crying evil against the constitution of society, which renders all this necessary! This is not a paltry reform, which little affects well-meaning and industrious people, but a subject which greatly interferes with human life. If the mothers are abused so, how fares the following generation? Right and justice, nay humanity, condemns the system which would sacrifice personal health and happiness. Each community must have a monopoly of the cleaning of clothes as well as homes, and we may rely they will be well executed. There can be no doubt Natural Society is the perfection of a constitution of society for man, because it is truth; in practice it equally proves itself the best by doing the whole necessary work of society on the most approved and also most extensive scale, thereby giving the greatest possible saving to the interest of the whole community.

In regard to house accommodation, present society presents a miserable aspect. So many old rickety and infested tumble-down dwellings on the one hand, and, on the other, so many spacious buildings not occupied as dwellings, but offices, shops, and saloons; the one is overcrowded as much as the other is uninhabited. That old house in the High Street, Edinburgh, which fell with such fatality, had almost an hundred inhabitants—respectable work-people; many are more crowded, and all such cannot but be, under the present system, sinks of corruption, destroyers of all health, polluters of the pure virtue of cleanliness. To have good house accommodation involves more than enough for a family without servants; and with servants there is a clumsy and degrading establishment. Inconvenience and dampness are common characteristics; want of ventilation is not less common, except it be by draughts, which are bad enough. What would we, in Natural Society, conceive to be our duty to those suffering from bad habitations? Preach contentment, patience, hope, and give a mite in charity? Never! Those who have an over-abundance of room would take a friend or two to occupy that abundance, and thereby allow more habitable space to the convenience of others until the erection of sufficient housing to render overcrowding unnecessary. This would be more like the action of human nature, or one human being towards another. The agricultural labourer is often worse housed than the mechanic in our towns; and the surroundings of our wealthy class are very frequently without complete purity.

There is probably a grand mistake in all our sanitary arrangements ; sewerage is incompatible with that absolute sweetness or freedom of taint in the atmosphere which ought to be the object in view. Pipes for surface water flowing off are very proper, but night-soil as properly ought to be conveyed to the country ; its aptness to assimilate with common earth is said to be remarkable, and it is then entirely free of any property to contaminate the atmosphere. There is not a doubt can be entertained that we do as yet possess very indifferent dwellings ; and the poor generally are forced to accept of domiciles which every intelligent man regards as wretched to the last degree. Why is this so ? Simply because the poor look perhaps too much for low rents, finding the smallest a heavy tax upon savings which are found to be next to impossible. The proprietors find their interest in maintaining these old ruins or otherwise faulty habitations by screwing more returns out of their capital than by making better or liberal improvements. They can do what they like with their own property, although it forms a snare to ill-health and misery to the victims !

The constitution of society is responsible for both the poor taking them and the proprietor retaining them inhabitable. The ten or twelve per cent. to the latter and the small rent-tax to the former, both overlook the higher sentiments for what is external. Wealth is necessary but health and virtue can be had along with wealth, and which forms a far more commendable and pleasureable condition. This is more especially the case of the poor. If the proprietor has been degraded and dead to feelings

of humanity, by keeping houses unfit for man, it is to be lamented, but difficult of cure. But the system necessitates, whether for single persons or a family, a complication of requisites perfectly incompatible for people's happiness and requirements; so, whether a house be occupied by two, twelve, or twenty-four, many or few, in proportion to the size, the chief end of life is frustrated, and hope is directed to a true system that will ensure human contentment and felicity.

Good-will.—Nothing is more conducive to happiness than the prominent and permanent existence of love or good-will—in families, associates, and to all people, and more especially those of good character. Kindness to others is not less a duty than a privilege, and which carries within itself its own reward. Where this feeling prevails, there is existing a tranquil comfort or pleasure. This arises out of our nature; whatever is beautiful and true is existing in our own or external nature. If our instincts are not circumscribed and perfect in their action, without being taught, they must be the more elevated by having an indefinite range for action. They are subject to an almost perfect development, and this is accomplished by the rational gaining the unquestionable ascendancy.

Human instincts include reason, conscientiousness, and benevolence. His is the highest, without question, on earth, and gives room for an unlimitable progress. Improvement is his motto, and more and more knowledge his means. The position at present occupied by the vanguard is greatly advanced in the intellectual and physical;

but for the moral and social there is required the great body of the people to see and resolve. Man has the conscious will and responsibility of his own actions, personally and collectively, and therefore the vanguard will do well, after doing their own duty in private and public, to wait patiently to find that progress which time will inevitably develope. Precepts are good in proportion as they are found to take root, assimilate, and yield beneficial results—practical education, insuring worthy habits and fair circumstances for the cultivation of all that is commendable ; but these in vital power cannot be compared with the mental and physical constitution which each person has from superior power. It is especially divine, because it is impossible of corruption while the being continues to exist, and its influence induces that peculiar character which clings to each, but at present defiled by numerous methods wholly caused by all human error, and we find the greatest to be the individual property principle.

This latter condition thrown aside, every variety of character beautifully takes part in harmonious actions in the useful and beneficent (insane individuals, of course, excepted, but even they are frequently made by errors in theory and practice—in fact, by the indifferent conditions of life, whether rich or poor). In the present state of society, we are surrounded with so much that is not good that one's head is apt to be misled in the beneficence and wisdom in the constitution of our nature ; even our heart has lost the delicate feelings of sympathy for suffering. The instinctive feeling within us is to share

our last meal with another who has none, and serve with heart and soul where service is most requisite. No doubt we are in an extraordinary state of society, on a false basis, and highly developed. The narcotic is applied to our instinctive good-will to others, as it is to our individual thwartings and chagrin. It is all rotten to the core, and to take up particulars, one branch of the subject would more than serve to fill the whole space at command; so we are forced to be general and brief.

Every one acknowledging us to be social beings will imagine a very common occurrence, where one would think the social feelings of good-will had disappeared. Two families are living under one roof; neither knows nor cares to know the other, because society makes it prudent to have a considerable amount of doubtful suspicions overcome before thinking of contracting an acquaintanceship. But this is directly the work of human ignorance in society's constitution—not from any insurmountable condition, nor innate corruption in nature. However varied man is to be found in his characteristics, they do not oppose each other, but simply may represent degrees in enthusiasm of all that is ingenious, wise, and true, or good, pure, and universally beneficial.

We dare not act out our generous feelings, because we would ruin ourselves, as thousands have again and again found out by experience. So we walk through life with our most beautiful sentiments as far as possible suppressed—a narrow, straight-laced manner, which thinketh, often with truth, that companionship involves evil temptations; but all this is induced by the common con-

ditions flowing from the monster evil of individual property. Yet this sociality of equals is essential for living in good-will, and which may rise to the position of virtue; for good-will that knows few neighbours and has no friendships ceases to have any virtue, by being unable to display in action vital good-will to others, and in a sense dead to the community, their actions being insignificant, because related only to themselves, and indifferent, because little affecting others.

Our duty is active good-will, to make life the more worth living, whether that be by instruction or amusement, or a combination of both, according to abilities. The greatest possible happiness results from this to all; the primary conditions are simple duty, and which forms a moral and intellectual atmosphere which bears its fruits with the same absolute certainty as the reverse conditions effect the reverse results in present society. Uniform law envelopes us on every hand, and whatever we plant or sow that we reap in return. If we could but realise our normal dependence, and assume nothing more, we would soon learn to act in society as men of science have for many years acted in practical knowledge, in always being directed by nature how best to avail ourselves in her formidable power and action—how best to render her subservient to ourselves. This belongs both to the first necessities and highest realisations of life.

Our action in nature is essentially different to action between each other. Present society may make men act on each other, and even with members of their own family, as we do with inanimate or unconscious matter;

but if it be legal to make interest predominant, it is not moral, and could not be practised to any one's disadvantage in Natural Society. The necessary duty—which is part of our inheritance or birthright—of good-will, which includes generous conduct in our best lights and opportunities, is stamped on our nature most indelibly. Let us realise this fact most cheerfully, and endeavour to insure conditions for future generations which will render it possible, or rather necessarily effect universal good-will, with its accompanying felicity. How is it to be effected? Can we imagine other or better means than united interests? And can we doubt nature to be a liberal landlord and master? See a single grain cast into the ground, it fructifies into a harvest of an hundred grains or upwards. We bestow the action or labour and enjoy the products. No; nature ever has been, and to the best of our knowledge ever will be, a proper subject in which our higher feelings will delight and confide, calling forth our feelings and gratitude in song and praise. But let us return to the simple subject in hand.

If our estimate of human nature is correct, there are innate tendencies to truth in the great majority, and in the few less fortunate there is no innate predisposition to violate truth, but for it a comparatively negative regard. The latter never can be the leaders, and they are influenced more by interest or thoughtlessness than conscientiousness. Now, Natural Society will more effectually neutralise opposing interest to all that is good, as well as give a positive interest in what is generous, so that our actions will likely be swayed into the interests of all

from some other sentiment than conscientiousness. Besides, the power of affection and kindness, which all are largely under, will lead to a development and reciprocation of them. The want of these sentiments being developed is well known to detract in a very great degree from the amiability of these neglected victims.

United interests give a power to each individual, and abuse of that power is acting against the united interests. Strict regard to truth is prominently the interest of the community. Public opinion would be severe on any marked departure; and for such no proper motive could be pleaded in extenuation, since none exists, and the base untruth itself without a cause is highly improbable. With cultivation in truth we have every virtue. Neither Natural Society nor low moral sentiments gives room for positive evil, for the temptations are removed, and few are proof against great temptations. In present society it is very different, since it is full of temptations, and already too many are bred in error—their second nature absolutely corrupted.

Let us take instruction from our nature, its prominent characteristics and principles, from a few illustrious names—Dr Chalmers to begin with:—‘Kindness, and honesty, and truth, are of themselves, and irrespective of their rightness, sweet unto the taste of the inner man. Malice, envy, falsehood, injustice, irrespective of their wrongness, have, of themselves, the bitterness of gall and wormwood.’ ‘There is a felt satisfaction in the thought of having done what we know to be right; and, in counterpart to this complacency of self-approbation,

there is a felt discomfort, amounting often to bitter and remorseful agony, in the thought of having done what conscience tells is wrong.' 'Virtue is not only seen to be right—it is felt to be delicious. There is happiness in the very wish to make others happy. There is a heart's ease or a heart's enjoyment even in the first purposes of kindness, as well as its subsequent performances. There is a certain rejoicing sense of clearness and consistency—the exactitude of justice and truth. There is a triumphant elevation of spirit in magnanimity and honour. In perfect harmony with this, there is a placid feeling of serenity and blissful contentment in gentleness and humility.' 'There is an elate independence of soul in the consciousness of having nothing to hide and nothing to be ashamed of. In a word, by the constitution of our nature, each virtue has its appropriate charm; and virtue, on the whole, is a fund of varied, as well as perpetual, enjoyment to him who hath imbibed its spirit and is under the guidance of its principles.' The Doctor would probably not like us to assert human nature, in its physical and mental constitution, perfect; but, in detail, he could show us that 'the hand that made us is divine.' There can be no preference of intellectual, moral, or physical; they are one in nature, and of one superior power. We have from Sydney Smith:—'Bodily want produces mental corruption as necessarily as corporeal comfort is the condition of intelligence and virtue.' 'What a motive it is for the exercise and universal diffusion of philanthropy to know that it is a law of the warm heart that its satisfaction is imperfect

so long as it beholds a single fellow-creature miserable !' And Sir John Herschel:—'The difference of the degrees in which the individuals of a general community enjoy the good things of life has been a theme of declamation and discontent in all ages ; and it is doubtless our paramount duty, in every state of society, to alleviate the pressure of the purely evil part of this distribution as much as possible, and, by all the means we can devise, secure the lower links in the chain of society from dragging in dishonour and wretchedness.' 'The advantages conferred by the augmentation of our physical resources through the medium of increased knowledge and improved art have this peculiar and remarkable property—that they are in their nature diffusive, and cannot be enjoyed in any exclusive manner by a few.' 'If this is true of physical advantages, it applies with still greater force to intellectual. Knowledge can neither be adequately cultivated nor adequately enjoyed by a few ; knowledge is not, like food, destroyed by use, but rather augmented and perfected.' 'The idea once conceived and verified, that great and noble ends are to be achieved, by which the condition of the whole human species shall be permanently bettered, by bringing into exercise a sufficient quantity of sober thoughts, and by a proper adaptation of means, is of itself sufficient to set us earnestly on reflecting what ends *are* truly great and noble, either in ourselves, or as conducive to others of a still loftier character, because we are not now, as heretofore, hopeless of attaining them.' Mr Paine, a most acute observer, remarks:—'Nothing tends to a greater corruption of manners

and principles than too great distress of circumstances.' —From the author of the 'Vestiges,' in the explanations, we have:—'What we are at present concerned with is the simple fact that morals—that part of the system of things which seemed least under natural regulation of law—is as thoroughly ascertained to be wholly so as the arrangements of the heavenly bodies.' 'But I may meanwhile remark its harmony with the great practical principle of Christianity, in establishing the universal brotherhood and social communion of man. And not only this, but it extends the principle of humanity to the meaner creatures also. *Life is everywhere one.* The inferior animals are only less advanced types of that form of being perfected in ourselves. Constituted as its head—with a peculiar psychological character, and destined by virtue of that position—we are yet essentially connected with the humbler vehicles of vitality and intelligence, and placed in moral relation to them. We are bound to respect even their feelings. And from obeying these moral laws we shall reap as certain a harvest of benefit to ourselves as by obeying any code of laws that ever was penned.'

It will be kept in mind our intention is no parrot recital of moral maxims, but rather an understanding of the vital principle, more especially relating to moral action. This principle is so far beyond human power, so established in the constitution of things and our own nature, that no evasion can be satisfactory. It has been so long perverted by the power of outward circumstances that its practical utility has been almost overlooked; at least, rarely relied on, and generally calumniated.

It is not strange, although a stubborn fact, that this principle of brotherhood and good-will can never be relied on under the individual property constitution of society. The war began upwards of two thousand years ago, and the triumph is yet in the future. Yet it is consoling to think, when the natural and true has triumphed, the reign will in all probability be perpetual with the existence of our race, thus leaving the many sad experiences undergone as very insignificant in time to that which will exist in something next to perfect harmony. Our nature clings to light and truth as strongly as it abhors the darkness of ignorance and falsehood ; but if, as at present, there is utmost confusion, and our very preceptors recommending the false, perhaps sincerely, and with an eulogium on the merits of a course of conduct on no better foundation, what can be expected but the neglect of the cause of truth ? And this is unquestionably universal, the only difference in our education being in degrees in the false.

Hence an elegant and clever writer tells us, to enjoy permanent motives of purity of head and heart, it is necessary to keep permanent love and admiration of them. Why so ? Because the tide is permanently against them, although its force is to increasing numbers yielding more and more every year. Hence the civilised world makes greater progress to universal good-will now than ever was known, and every step once taken is rendered secure by the intelligence of the great majority of those who form the leaders of our race. Imagine the secrecy of principles held by philosophers as in bygone

ages to be now mooted or pretended ! To inaugurate conditions which will simply lead the young to habits of virtue, in which the counteracting conditions shall be sunk, is the grand duty before the patriotic of the present age ; and to thoroughly appreciate the coalescing agencies in the natural world, including true moral principles ; to render all nobler exertion to effect a nobler happiness in life ; to make all virtue result in pleasure, all duty performed in serene satisfaction, is the duty of the wise.

Vice is the natural opposite to virtue in the natural world, and ought to be known and treated as such in every society. Public opinion is much better adapted for this end than any legal means ; but the power of public opinion has been turned into other channels in present society. Leaving moral natures uncultivated, moral perceptions blunted, and society presenting abundant illustrations of moral turpitude, what wonder if vice has lost almost all its sting ? There are many palliating circumstances to save us from the calumniating belief that truth and virtue are not to be expected from human nature under any conditions. Let us search our own heads and hearts in the answer to the question—if we find in practice most enjoyment in truth or falsehood ? or prefer honour and virtue or vice and criminal actions ? We know what the answer must be, because our nature is not the imperfect work of a being like man. It might be like Paul's case, which has found a response in so many persons, that the soul or spirit or mental is willing, but the flesh is weak. We know and will the true and good, but powerful is the current which has innovated

and still expands its force in opposition to the physical being ; this too often prevails. Custom and habit, if corrupt, will infallibly degrade the whole nature.

To adduce testimonies of human nature being inclined to the virtuous and prudent, from observation, might be assuring ; but this very much depends upon the external conditions. Under tyranny and injustice human nature is crushed to the earth—without blossom and without fruit. In peace and industry, every town could furnish many heroic cases which pass by for the successors to pass the same ordeal again—which is generally privation, toil, suffering, and independence of public charity. Every nation has many to speak favourably of them. Let us hear a few words from a writer in the Scotsman, a few days ago, on the Norwegians:—‘ Poor and rich alike seem to be gifted with innate good nature. Yet I should suppose there lies a powerful, though dormant, spirit within them. It is a common remark, that men who are quiet and gentle by nature are, when roused to passion, unusually violent and terrible. I could well believe that the bold daring spirit of the ancient Northmen still slumbers in the breasts of their peaceful descendants. Among other qualities, the Norwegians seem to me to possess in a high degree straightforwardness and simplicity.’

The great want necessary in producing the best qualities of our nature to be prominent is in good external conditions—common interests and enjoyments, in accordance with, and subservient to, the dictates of nature, reason, and conscience. The authorities are very

numerous that might be quoted in support of the vital principle of innocence and morality being its own reward and our normal condition on earth ; but of these we shall only take three more.

In the last century, Miraband writes :—‘ *Morals* is a science of facts ; to found them, therefore, on an hypothesis inaccessible to man’s senses, of which he has no means of proving the reality, is to render them uncertain ; it is to cast the log of discord into his lap ; to cause him unceasingly to dispute upon that which he can never understand. To assert that the ideas of morals are innate, or the effect of *instinct*, is to pretend that man knows how to read before he has learned the alphabet ; that he is acquainted with the laws of society before they are either made or promulgated.’ The hypothesis basis of morality is almost extinct ; the science has made a large advance since he wrote. But again—‘ *Morals* would be a vain science if it did not incontestably prove to man that his interest consists in being virtuous.’ ‘To be virtuous, then, is to place his interest in that which accords with the interest of others ;’ and this is illustrated in a person who renders himself loved by continued good and generous actions. ‘In corrupt societies it is necessary to be corrupt in order to become happy.’ This latter extract is not given as commendable, but as a common fact of external circumstances acting on human nature, in spite of mental remonstrances.

Francis W. Newman, of our own day, is a contrast to our foregoing authority :—‘ *Guilelessness* is the whole secret of divine peace ; and happy are any who attain it

before a convulsion of soul proceeding.' 'But, from the establishment of this guilelessness of heart, and peace flowing out of it, a new era of spiritual life necessarily commences.' 'Oh, dogma! dogma! how dost thou trample under foot love, truth, conscience, justice. Was ever Moloch worse than thou?' 'Morality is the end—spirituality is the means. Religion is the handmaid of morals; we must be spiritual in order that we may be in the highest and truest sense moral.' 'I cannot refuse to add my testimony, such as it is, to the effect, that *the majority is always true hearted.*'

We come now to the last, Bishop or Joseph Butler:—
 'In the natural course of things, virtue, *as such*, is actually rewarded, and vice, *as such*, punished.' 'For virtue consists in a regard to what is right and reasonable, as being so; in a regard to veracity, justice, charity, in themselves; and there is surely no such thing as a like natural regard to falsehood, injustice, cruelty. If it be thought that there are instances of an approbation of vice, as such, in itself, and for its own sake (though it does not appear to me there is any such thing at all; but supposing there be), it is evidently monstrous—as much so as the most acknowledged perversion of any passion whatever.' 'Let us return to the earth, our habitation, and we shall see this happy tendency of virtue, by imagining an instance not so vast and remote—by supposing a kingdom, or society of men upon it, perfectly virtuous, for a succession of many ages—to which, if you please, may be given a situation advantageous for universal monarchy. In such a state there would be no such thing as faction; but men

of the greatest capacity would, of course, all along have the chief direction of affairs willingly yielded to them, and they would share it among themselves without envy. Each of these would have the part assigned him to which his genius was peculiarly adapted; and others, who had not any distinguished genius, would be safe, and think themselves very happy, by being under the protection and guidance of those who had.' And in his sermon on Romans ii., 14, '*that every man is naturally a law to himself, that every one may find within himself the rule of right, and obligations to follow it.*'

However, this must follow an education of truth, taste, and industry; and then it forms the foundation of self-sovereignty, giving the ruling power into the intellect, whereby the passions are kept in their place, a rational course of living is established, a peaceful and useful citizen secured. This work has already begun, but cannot be fully carried out. In public the irrational impulses are generally restrained; in private they find scope with impunity, to the unheard-of misery of thousands, and degrading all engaged.

Uncharitable actions ought to be received as weeds in our flower garden. They are unsightly in a human being, besides being self-condemned, and probably reflect the same treatment in return. As we are treated, so we incline to treat others, and especially those under. It would be difficult to say how far the spirit of revenge is on its way to oblivion, but unkind actions detain it on its welcome journey. These apparent minor actions, sedulously avoiding the ungenerous and cultivating the

spirit of good-will, make the grand distinction between the noble and the ignoble. No one is excluded the ranks of the noble, but many are hurried into the ranks of the ignoble before they have known the grand object of life, felt the beneficence of nature, or learned the grand lesson of love and affection. They are to be pitied and helped. Reared in moral corruption, enveloped in all mental darknesses—what monstrous abuse! And, of course, many who are ‘all right’ think they have neither business nor duty connected with this work. But they dare to heed not these unfortunates, and revile them. Ah! revile them! Save us, save us from such teachers!

We who have been more fortunate have this load of duty lying at our door, and those who accept it not will leave it to those willing to undertake the work. With our pity there must be vital action to rescue the fallen, and give particular attention to save more falling into such utter darkness and corruption. Let us have an alliance or co-operation in the work of real and pure reformation; there has long existed one of indifference and sufferance. These are two masters we cannot serve at the same time, and which we in present society have too long resolved to recognise. Were there the possibility of a doubt, under common good conditions, of securing a virtuous and noble people in community, we would be undone in all hope in approximating to human perfectability. But there can be none.

V.—EDUCATION.

In the ‘Home School; or, Hints on Education,’ by Dr N. Macleod, will be found many valuable remarks;

but, proposing no vital change other than personal, were it to be expected of our nature, in general or universal; and, in spite of opposing circumstances, to attain an education essentially good, there might be justification to linger and encourage conditions to that effect; but it is absolutely impossible. It is no use to prune and cultivate the thistle if it is grain we are in quest of. Society presents innumerable examples where a thorough book, and a complete home and exemplary education, has been given by parents generally accounted praiseworthy; yet some of the children thus acted on behave so irrational as to draw freely public censure. At pages 33 and 34 a scene in point is given as known by the author.

If such are effected where means are used personally, what can be expected where the means are beyond the parents' power? And, if personal efforts are so ineffectual, are we still to believe them all that is necessary? Never. Yet let us not neglect them for one instant; they are most assuredly our duty under all circumstances; but also let us endeavour to arrive at some method wherein we may with some confidence anticipate pleasant results. Such we only conceive to exist in some form of the true and natural state of society.

We may cull a few ideas from 'The Home School.' The following is not natural perfection in our phraseology, but very similar in reality:—'God in everything sets perfection before us, because He is in all things himself perfect, and desires we should be like himself in all things. Noble aims create noble efforts.' In the pre-

face we have:—‘The severe toil, late and early, in the work-shop or counting-house, the absorbing love of gain, the ceaseless “movement,” the constant bustle, the intense excitement, sadly interfere with the earnest and quiet duties of the family.’ ‘He (“our Lord,” says the Doctor) says—“For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?” Not anything!—not the whole universe! To a man himself, his own soul—his own life and happiness—are more valuable than all else.’ ‘*They* (children, says Macleod) *belong to Him, and are His (God’s) property, not yours.*’ ‘The happiness or cheerful obedience of the child is essential to secure the foundation of good habits. Without this, it may be forced up, but never trained up in the way in which it should go.’ He sketches a city habitation, and exclaims—‘Is this *a home* in which to enjoy life and rear a family? All parents would do well to remember how much in every case home education depends on the health and happiness of the children, and how these again are so much connected with a well-aired, clean, and cheerfully situated home!’ ‘The necessity of labour is a great blessing in our present state. It is good for fallen man that he should eat his bread in the sweat of his brow. God has annexed labour to the possession of all that is really worth possessing.’ ‘Results are with God—duty with you.’ As we said before, there is one radical change necessary previous to the possibility of general or universal reformation, in its broad sense. As the building on the sandy

foundation, it may be ornamented and beautified, rearranged in details to different fashions or tastes; but for the everlasting storms of human passions it affords no shelter: it wants power to purify, it lacks truth. There is something pleasing and sublime in the idea of the necessity of more happiness being required to effect a more proper education, and that education of virtue and truth in its action again re-effects to others more health and happiness. Yet such is fact; and Dr Macleod is too acute to overlook its great importance.

Now for our indications of education in Natural Society. Women are by nature, as well as their relative position to the introduction of our race on earth, the first preceptors in education; and what is most desirable for their benefit when engaged in the nursery is most beneficial to general society. All employment or toil of a necessary kind, by women before and after parturition, ought to be entirely voluntary, or on their own account. In general, the toil of tending the offspring is more arduous than the common duty of labour, and in many cases assistance will be necessary, less or more, throughout the whole time of wet-nursing. There is, perhaps, little occasion to advert to the great misery and mortality in present society, both to the female parent and child, from a cold, regardless world, principally from overabundance of duties thrown on the mother, which encroach on the health and welfare of both. These are too prominent in society to be dwelt on, and too aggravated to require argumentation. Such cases in Natural Society, like all others, may be assured of quiet and leisure to

take what exercise in the open air is deemed desirable, along with other common good conditions.

This lays the first stones in the building of a good education, by giving Nature an opportunity of doing her utmost for the original constitution of the offspring. When the child is perhaps two or three years of age, he may, with the parents' wish, be placed in the 'infants' school,' either for good or only for the day, the mother, if well, engaging in some necessary labour—in leisure time caring for her child along with his father, according as the dispositions prompt—those of great philoprogenitiveness keeping their children more, during both the leisure time and night; and others who find it more agreeable to engage in social intercourse or the cultivation of any of the virtues might let the hour be somewhat late for the child being removed home for the night, if this was thought proper and desirable. As time rolled on, the child might be taken still home at night, being in the boarding-school through the day, or allowed to lodge there also. The intercourse being perfectly free at all times, and the best treatment uniformly bestowed, ignorant and neglectful parents might have a care and responsibility taken off their shoulders, and their children enjoy benefits throughout life from this same cause.

The education itself—what should it be? What should it be but the best, for what more important and particular duty have we to perform? But to introduce them into maturer duties at the age of thirteen or fourteen, these boarding-school children are separated into the wings or departments of the town for the different sexes,

and simultaneously begin the necessary business of life in entering some department of industry suitable to the capacity and inclination of the individual. The free intercourse of social life, of both sexes and all departments of industry, would be perfectly complete, except where the individual chose to have privacy, which is a proper enough right, although it may not be a common demand. Yet, if a female desires to avoid the company of an individual, it would be akin to crime to allow that individual (who can be no gentleman) to force companionship. How can you avoid it? says a doubtful. Public opinion gives such conduct censure, and the assurance of distaste for that company—either of which ought to be enough; if not, we may safely leave such cases to be dealt with when they occur, and they will find plenty to assist in the remedy.

With this free intercourse in our toil and in our leisure hours there will be much charming communion. It is exceptional to have an evening of heartfelt pleasure now; but in these conditions we may safely anticipate the exception in one evening of dull, sensual, and questionable happiness. We must hold our rights of privacy; but the fear of frequent intrusion is an offspring of unprincipled, immoral, and brass-faced experience in present society. In these natural conditions of community the characters of all will be generally excellent, and well known, so that most favourable circumstances will exist for happy courtships and marriages. They would not only be accelerated and augmented, but purified to the touch-stone of a higher character and merit, while the field of choice would be extended to the greatest possible degree on both sides.

And what is the result of marriage forms a circle—the orbit of human life on earth.

But the question remains—What kind of education is probable? What is education? According to Webster, it is the ‘act of educating; the act of developing and cultivating the various physical, intellectual, and moral faculties; formation of the manners, and improvement of the mind; instruction, tuition, nurture.’ Education, then, is not so definite as the unthinking might suspect. The learning of our native language, or various languages, is not education. These only form the instruments by which education may be enlarged, improved, and utilised. Vital knowledge, which may be expected to influence us to the better, elevate us to be comparatively superior beings, is not to be expected from the mere learning to read, write, calculate, &c.; it is more by realising the wonders of nature. Here we have the all-perfect; and the grand duty of the future, in education, is to open the eyes to see for themselves, in as far as possible, this sublime mystery.

In natural phenomena, whether we look into the minutæ or subjects comparatively complete and involving general principles, the mind will be ennobled, and a sphere of everlasting pleasant occupation is certain. If this source is not largely employed, on which the arts and sciences are built, the mind stands almost certain of being corrupted, for activity is one necessary condition; and if not in the pure sources of nature, it must be in the artificially impure and sensual, or artificially founded in the supernatural or unnatural. Improvement in speaking the pure

English is going on favourably in society, and this in general conversation will be a great assistance for the young in acquiring the language. There are many obvious faults in the language, but no one has authority to make amendations. Without something like delegated authority for this purpose, no means can exist but by personal responsibility, which might prove extremely troublesome; so the let-alone principle has been that commonly or uniformly practised. However, the child that has begun to learn the first lessons in the language, might be taught, at the same time, every common and interesting object presenting itself before him. He shall learn the alphabet no slower were he at the same time to distinguish by the common name the flowers daily seen in the garden.

As the pupil advances, all knowledge ought to extend in proportion. A museum attached to every school would greatly assist the teachers giving any explanations necessary. The whole manufactures of the community would be proper subjects of inspection and knowledge, the juveniles being trained to obedience, and under good management. The elements of every science ought to be common knowledge in schools; then the individual tastes would display themselves, and enable preceptors and pupils to choose some department of employment in accordance, thereby enabling both the individuals and the community to derive the greatest amount of utility and benefit. The two, language and objects of or from nature—science and art—must be taught together; the first requires much unpleasant perseverance to those who are

not possessed with more of the parrot than the philosopher ; the second gives a stimulus which lightens and interests, realises and rivets the language in the memory. Advantage will thus be taken of children's intense curiosity to form a fund for future character, knowledge, and enjoyment ; and, at the same time, the unpalatable tasks in learning the language will be modified very much. Why is the school almost universally regarded with a feeling of antipathy ?—why does it appear a hardship, both in the confinement and the tasks imposed, by boys and girls of spirit ? Simply because there is so little tact in the practice, so little fact illustrative of knowledge or nature, and so much of theory, theory—nothing but theory. The first table of arithmetic, of four farthings one penny, &c., requires little more than to be seen, when it remains in the memory, ever ready when wanted. How is this, but that known matters of fact are being associated in the mind with the theoretic terms ? Otherwise, as in some parts of Britain, no doubt, the table would be learned by rote the same as all the others. Geography might be made a delightful study were all the accessories made available. For these purposes schools would require—rude, and in miniature, where better was not available—a museum, a large garden, a picture gallery of oil, water-colour, engravings of steel and wood, lithographs, and photographs on glass and paper.

Theory to children is absurd nonsense and hurtful folly. There is an innate memory for words ; but this is not to be made a falcon to blow the pupils up into wind bottles, but to go along with the more important

teaching of knowledge. Learning of various languages requires a predominance of this organ of memory which science calls 'language;' but to teach as if we had little else to learn is more than a mistake; it is cruelty to the young, and nugatory in its effects—the very reverse of what parents must desire. Remember that knowledge powerfully tends to form a character of pure principles and a spirit of humility.

The greatest names our race can point to confirm what we have just asserted. The teachers would receive a boon by a change to a more useful and interesting mode of doing their duty. Active habits are good for the young, and seldom require to be stimulated; but the teachers ought to direct here also, or at least see that they were as they ought to be, and directed, when they had an opportunity, to improve their games. We have seen some games prevalent more than questionable; but the teacher's duty was bounded by the walls of the school. The teacher will naturally cultivate a good understanding with all under him or her; and, without an inclination for children's company and improvement, it is improper to undertake the position. The scholars imbibe the spirit of the teacher when mutual esteem is suffered to exist; and, by the due development of this principle, the scholar has the human or artificial tendency to form an estimable member of society, added by the power of 'knowledge divine.'

Gymnastics are so far good or necessary; but the out-of-door instruction, when the weather was agreeable, might take the place of much of that physical exercise

by combining the two ; and experience tells the superiority of that combination. By these excursions they could add to their museum in geological, botanical, &c., &c., specimens of their own gathering ; and children of very tender years require very little hammering instruction in this walk. They are thirsting for instruction, and consequently greater dealers in asking questions. And if at thirteen, fourteen, or fifteen years of age the young beings enter on daily duties and a sort of junior citizenship, they will have acquired some knowledge and habits as a foundation on which self-culture may become the second nature developing itself, for a little real knowledge of natural objects begets a taste for its continued acquisition ; and an aptness that is always adding to accumulated knowledge some new light, in course of time, produces all those who are so much esteemed both for their great knowledge and exemplary character. And this mode of life has an advantage peculiarly its own, in the exquisite happiness it affords both in the society of those of similar tastes and from the subjects themselves.

The departments of nature or science and art are open to every person who has eyes to see. Our variety of peculiar tendencies or differences of taste have a field as varied ; kinds of leisure-hour occupation might almost be said to be innumerable. What is this wonderful natural creation to the many hard-wrought, mental or physical, workmen of present society ? Their positions are circumscribed by a narrow book-education, and no real knowledge worthy the name. And where the supply of money is quite inadequate to the extravagant outlays

necessary in the individual isolation of present society, what self-culture is possible? We are all less or more under difficulties, and consequently we find self-culture extremely exceptional. The enjoyments and ennobling influences are thrown away upon us, since we will not or cannot yet take the gifts. In natural subjects, how beautifully the feelings become united—old and young, male and female, townman and countryman, are equally affected; national animosities disappear before a few common sentiments of appreciation in the great mysteries.

Education must be a training to impress a taste for right and rational living, thinking, and acting, as well as writing and reading. No secondary result can be accepted for the principal object. It must be broader than all science and art, although it need not include but a portion of either, for it must give a breadth which tends to all knowledge, and to hope for some new lights from the great fountain of all science and art, while the spark within is enlightened and purified from the same source. Do not the millions of worlds in space speak or teach us an unspeakable lesson? and the millions of animalculæ generated in a summer's week from some stagnant water and decaying vegetables raise our admiration of the unfathomable power in Nature, while it might modify the arrogance of ignorance? We must realise these, and such as these, allowing the great educator, Nature, to be the primary mover in all our doings, and the successful issue of our undertakings will have the best guarantee. Science and art have extended their past limits, but scope for further extension is wide

as ever. Hence, education must overleap the boundaries of successful human explorations, when occasion fits, and teach the unparalleled wonders of the natural creation.

We may be told to begin at the beginning, to creep before walking, and so on ; but, allowing a particle of truth in this, it is far better, and nearer truth, to give the most vital truth, whenever it can be digested, than to run any risk of impoverishment. We never can have too much pure and comfortable air. Taking our utmost wants, there remains an immensity ; so with truth to the mental—too much cannot be appropriated, and it is the height of bigotry to assiduously circumscribe limits. Method and regard to age will be properly considered in the means and quality of knowledge taught ; but we have had a supply so miserable and scanty in the past and present time, that we may open our whole stock and experience, and time will tell how soon the children can understand what is intelligible. It might surprise one to find how well a boy or girl of ten years could understand any of the common arts in society. Power in itself is no more understood than physical existence by man—for instance, the electric power, or that of attraction, and the atom, or the moon ; so the infinitude of nature must be a part of the lesson to children, and why should not their eyes be opened to that so common before them ? Are they not to be told that human knowledge is simply observational—we are not creators or inventors, but followers of truth from experience—recognisers of facts from observation ?

Obedience to nature is our highest duty and most im-

portant interest ; in common phraseology, it is love to God, and love to man. The young cannot enjoy the purifying influence of truth too soon, nor in too plain language ; nor the aged retain the simplicity and joyfulness of the innocence of youth too long. Nothing can excel the serene pleasure diffused in the aged able and inclined to impart natural truths to the young, who, on their part, are delighted to be instructed, and display a feeling of veneration for the instructor. Such happiness remains present to both parties at the call of memory, to lighten and cheer any moments that might have been dull, besides elevating the characters of both parties ; for what elevates the character like frequent contact with natural action and natural truth ? In short, Natural Society must take the responsibility of educating all the young, including the private and public, family and worldly, scientific and industrial, excepting assistance from parents and others in their pastime, but only as a voluntary duty. We need not refer to the deficiency in present society in the domestic (which includes the learning of lessons for school) education. How can it be attended to in a family where every condition necessary is reversed ?

Let us ever remember truthfulness is the foundation of all good education, because this ensures a good character. It tends to a more and more delicate honour or self-respect, which would not be guilty of an untruth although the temptation was strong. In regard to this important aspect of our education, let us see how the vital influences of present society act. The establishment of individual

property gives rise to the too common practice of speculation, even before childhood has fairly been left behind. We are corrupted as soon as we can open our eyes and put forth our hand. For a child of spirit to avoid this unwholesome position is simply impossible, and is in fact an unmitigated evil. We have the instructions of individual property—take nothing that belongs to another, whether it belongs to parents, neighbours, or strangers; but we are not, in nature, guided by precept alone. Precept is only good and useful when expressing what is good and true, which individual property is not, being entirely an artificial invention of humanity; and the helping of one's-self to ripe fruit is naturally no criminal action. Hence 'telling' young people who feel strong desires for things not artificially in their power—often as much for curiosity as sensual appetites—they must not take what belongs to another, has little impression in comparison to the sweetmeats or pocket-knife, which have a reverse natural and living power; and no sooner are the instructions broken through than lying is necessary to keep the forbidden act secret, or screen off the effects of having been found guilty. Ultimately these two—telling falsehoods and acting wrongfully in regard to property—go together; and the nature liable to the one often has a tendency to the other, although this is not uniform.

Thus present society leads to larceny and lies, and both to the most erroneous and consciously outlawed character. Necessity, as in every case, was the overpowering influence, however great or small the temptation

was to depart from a life agreeable to humanity or our own conscience. We are all degraded by these influences, directly and indirectly. We in Britain who mix with people secretly contaminated are necessarily tainted with hypocrisy. They are legally pure, but often worse than the victim of impulse to an act which leaves its stigma for life. We have learned to raise monuments to talent, &c., of certain persons of the great, *only* after they are dead. While in life they were liable to errors which might rank them, by the standard of common sense, disgraceful members of society.

In Robert Macnish's 'Introduction to Phrenology,' like many other works on this science, there are many passages illustrative of society's influence on the education of its members. We take one question and answer:— 'In some heads the propensities, moral sentiments, and intellect are pretty well balanced. What character results from this combination? It is good, bad, or indifferent, according to the situation in which the individual is placed. If in favourable circumstances well educated, and under the influence of good example, he may turn out a fair member of society; if exposed to the contaminating influence of vice, he will be apt to run into it, and become a rogue.' If this is correct, we may infer from the prevalence of virtue, honesty, and honour, under a continual influence to the reverse vices, that the great majority of innate mental faculties are unquestionably not only well balanced, but balanced in the favour of virtue, truthfulness, and honour.

In 'Moral Philosophy,' according to George Combe,

'a more extensive and scientific education is the most valuable remedy for these evils (erroneous and no mental enjoyments). We have seen mental cultivation banish drunkenness from the classes holding rank and respectability in society, and the same effect may be expected to follow from the extension of education downwards.' It must be a 'scientific education,' because it has an interest and gives pleasure, which invites further research—which is simply useful and innocent occupation. All the arts are derived from this education. Dividing them into two, we might say the common arts are for necessary labour, and the elegant arts for the employment of leisure time. Present society is deficient in this latter *kind* of education, and the *mode* of education is not less faulty ; and on this we will allow Dr A. Combe a few words :—
 'In modern education too much is done by means of books, and too little by trusting to the natural powers of the mind. When books were difficult of access, and knowledge was taught and transmitted orally, a higher effort of attention was excited, the mind worked more vigorously, and retained better and in more distinct form what it had acquired.' Dr Woodford, her Majesty's Inspector of Schools, is working to the same effect in teaching 'Natural Grammar,' as every person may see in the newspapers ; and it is accomplished by bringing most glaringly out the surface imperfections of our language.

VI.—MARRIAGE.

Marriage is one of those institutions which is to be found in the history of our race almost under every di-

versity or form, the main or fundamental points of which have been ignored, disregarded, and set at defiance in the great majority of instances. This is the more observable from marriage being a simple and definite act between two beings, one of each sex, whose mutual esteem and respect become intensified, and which is consummated by sincere resolves to mutual devotion and chastity, with the accompanying act, certifying the fact in the public register, and living openly and publicly in the married state. This appears simple and natural to us; but barriers, in the form of human institutions, have sadly disfigured the purity of marriage, even among ourselves, where motives of rank and wealth are predominant, and at the best hardly separable from the pure promptings of the natural impulses of our mental nature.

These base and cankering motives of wealth are, in this respect, gross enough; but when they lead to the hideous spectacle of prostitution and illegitimacy, first by cramping and thwarting the beautiful instincts of our nature by ignorance and artificial conditions, and secondly by unchastity and licentiousness in the one sex *for*, and in the other *by*, wealth, the institution of individual property, on which all this originates, is no doubt the blackest demon with which the race is degraded and demoralised.

Libertinism and prostitution emanate from, and are caused by, the present constitution of society. The money-power is predominant in both parties, although in reversed positions; and these, once called forth, carry a power of their own which multiplies the evil, by assimilating others in the adoption of their own vice

and corruption. The conditions of society create the evil monster, and if these conditions be irreproachable in 'divine right,' 'sacred individual property,' is there anything 'divine' or 'sacred' in human agreements which is destructive of human character and happiness? Yet we will have them so; and to shew mutual duty and justice in a political sense, the rich man is supposed to support the poor man in the enjoyment of his right to something or nothing of property, and the poor man is to protect the rich in possession of all his property claims.

If this is divine, it is right to have united support to enforce the conditions of individual property; but if it is human error, the retracing our steps cannot be too soon undertaken. Yet, in regard to this remarkable union in support of individual property, the poor cannot marry without extreme risk of something worse than blasting one's own affections, nor the great majority in the families of the rich from extravagant notions or necessities. Hence much celibacy, and late unions, after life's best health and vigour are impaired, and bad or at least inflexible habits are contracted. Nature indicates most positively and distinctly the time for marriage, and influences which disturb her arrangements are most assuredly injurious; so if the subject possesses the importance that uniformly is allowed, those evils that tend to influence our actions to disobedience must be dealt with as they deserve.

As examples of the various customs in regard to marriage cannot be required, we will confine our remarks to general principles. One who has written on 'Marriage

Customs' says :—' The principle which gives rise to love is as innate in the Indian as the European, and the difference is only in the manner of revealing itself.' The same writer assures us—' Mutual separation (among the American Indians) takes place whenever it is the wish of the parties, who generally give a week's notice, assigning the reason of such separation. The small pieces of the rod which were distributed at the wedding are now collected, and consumed by fire in the presence of the husband and wife. These divorces are effected without dispute, quarrel, or contradiction. The women become equally at liberty with the men to re-marry when they are so disposed. The children, forming the wealth of these nations, are, at the period of separation, equally divided between the father and mother. Although the privilege of changing is unrestricted, *there are many savages that never have more than one wife.*'

It is easily seen that happy marriages are those which exclude all thought of separation ; but the open alternative of divorce might be made a powerful means of modifying conduct which threatened to make marriage unhappy ; and were such conduct persisted in, what could be more natural and necessary than absolute divorce ? Separation without divorce may be necessary only where divorce cannot be easily obtained ; and any subsequent union, however good, cannot be considered regular.

We have one of these, and apologised for, in the memoirs of 'Mirabeau : a Life History,' and the case is Mirabeau and Henrietta Van Haren, on which the

writer remarks—‘To all our fair readers who are inclined to curl their pure lips in scorn for this woman, and to despise her name, I would say, Remember that the ceremony is but the outward symbol and (for civil ends) valueless, and that the inward union is the true one after all; remember that she who merely resigns herself, much-loving, to one man, and remains faithful to him, is far different to her who trades upon her body; and, above all, that the impurity and frail desires of the head and heart are as sinful God-wards as those of the body.’ Divorce, however, almost as easy as marriage itself, would render this state unnecessary. In Natural Society nothing would prevent this from being resorted to for mutual benefit, since both parties would be equally independent in the means of living, and consequently there would be no quarrelling about a settlement, or fear of the fulfilment of its conditions.

In present society there will always be difficulties, less or more certain, in the matrimonial life. It generally involves additional expense, and no additional income. There are rare exceptions. Yes, where the wife can more than support herself; but our manly nature will seldom brook this, even were the case pressing. The difficulties become insurmountable, and the poor are retained very poor, with no savings to fall back upon or raise their positions. These are degrading circumstances; and even were both husband and wife to be agreeable that the latter should engage in some remunerative labour, however humble, the chances are it could not be had. They are fortunate or ingenious wives who contrive to

get their time filled up in remunerative work. We take for granted they first have fulfilled the duties of help-mate, and, although probably more than enough, contrive to do greater public service to secure greater abundance of the necessaries of life. It is incomparably prettier to have the just or regular amount of labour, when able, and expect none when disabled, occupying at all time an honourable position, as it must be in Natural Society, for all wives. Is this not a boon to the husband and also the wife ?

In the married life at present the happiness of both are mutually dependent—the weakness and failings of either involve, perhaps, the greater trouble to the other. Even when the conduct has included the whole round of immoralities, the most distant hope of divorce cannot even be entertained. But the whole institution is full of such evils. The ceremony itself is often attended with absurd extravagance in comparison to the wealth of the parties. We have observed, perhaps suffered, by the vulgar notion of making a sensation. Such a one was married, and the party had nothing but beef-steak pie and apple-tart for dinner ! He was married in a suit of clothes made and sported six months ago !! There was not a drop of wine offered !!!

Thus the vulgar ideas engendered by our false positions in the property-inspired customs are not only extravagant in practice, but they spoil the grand principles in our nature of giving preference to what is noble and elevating, and substituting a sensual regard to Mammon and the things of Mammon. In Natural Society a very different

order of things may be expected. At such occasions as that of marriage, as at every other, the material necessities may be safely left to those whose duties are involved in their supply. Is it not beneath man to be always mentally engaged in considering what he shall eat, what he shall drink, in what he shall be clothed, and what apeing he shall assume?

Let each person have his department in industrial labour, whether in the preparation of food or other analogous occupation, the duties of which must be well performed; after that he is a man—mentally fit to appreciate the works of God, or engage in some art or leisure-time work of an elevating character. So, when his marriage is celebrated, he troubles himself about no department of common industry, but is social, diffusing and enjoying much happiness with his friends, in the common accomplishments of a superior education. Were the parties married particularly beloved and esteemed, the public, probably, would give the occasion some extra testimony of the respect and regard with which they were held.

The agreement of a dozen couples to have their nuptial ceremonies on one occasion would be almost certain to effect a local public rejoicing; and surely no rational being would demur to 'a little fun now and then,' or that such should take place, to mark in memory's prospective the act which, in one sense, is the most important to self in our whole lifetime. Things are here estimated at the natural and proper value. Sumptuous feasting can have no peculiar relish to those who are accustomed to

abundance of the best food, and know enough is much better than more than enough. The modes of testifying true liberality must be changed to the personal character—no vulgar show, but the continual emulation to a perfect and generous conduct, which never faileth to be kindly appreciated by the public. Besides, the most genuine pleasure is the grand object; and for that purpose the friends of the bridal parties must make arrangements and exertions to ensure a pleasure party of the most enthusiastic kind, whether it be a ball, concert, a mixture of both of these, theatricals, or any other mode. In these conditions of Natural Society, liberality of character no more than artistic performance can be commanded by purchase. All virtues must be personal, and personal kindness to others the more common in consequence. There is perfect equality in rank, so distinction for liberality and generosity will be a legitimate subject of emulation. And hence the duty and pleasure we will experience in assisting friends to a joyful nuptial celebration.

Thus, Natural Society encourages the virtues as a standard of comparative merit, such as kindness, talent, and genius. These are the things we would that all could enjoy, for their own sake and the beneficent reflected light on our fellow-mortals. Present society has a very different standard under its protecting care. It is power over each other by means of mammon. It is early taught, and many persons never get beyond these vulgar conditional matters. The virtues beyond paying just debts are Utopian, and earth and life at best

filled with cares and troubles. There is much to mar the uniform good feeling which ought to exist in the matrimonial life. The disposition and temperament of each not being sufficiently known before marriage, and the many duties necessary to each other, give plenty room for raising high words and ill feeling. Genuine love overcomes all these ; but they are unnecessarily numerous, and where less love is existing, and one particle of the spirit of retaliation, the union must be essentially unhappy.

The sexes, as individuals, are generally isolated, yet sociality is necessary before marriage, and conducive of great happiness. Were young men and women to encourage much social intercourse, it would give ground for scandal and hopes which could not be fulfilled, from external circumstances. The sensible and principled feel this acutely, and the unprincipled take advantage and create an indefinite amount of misery. The circumstances for them are tempting, and not unfrequently they secure a comfortable pecuniary position by making their affections an article of traffic. And a few of the class commonly reputed most guilty of this execrable trade, naturally enough believing other people to be like themselves, tell us community of property is uniformly advocated with community of wives ; common rights and duties involve women as property for common use of men. Consummate slanderers ! No matter if never asserted and uniformly denied, the assertion is reproduced from some equally ignorant with themselves in their own class, as if they had a good end in view to justify the

means and the falsehood. The public are escaping from such irrational tutelage, and in relying on themselves, in time they will discriminate the true from the false.

George Combe says—‘The domestic character of man is founded in, or arises from, the innate faculties of amateness, philoprogenitiveness, and adhesiveness. These give him desires for a companion of a different sex, for children, and for the society of human beings in general. Marriage results from the combination of these three faculties with the moral sentiments and intellect, and is thus a natural institution. Some persons conceive that marriage, or union for life, is an institution only of ecclesiastical or civil law; but this idea is erroneous. Where the organs above enumerated are *adequately* and *equally* possessed, and the moral and intellectual faculties predominate, union for life, or marriage, is a natural result. It prevailed among the ancient Greeks and Romans, and exists among the Chinese, and many other nations who have not embraced either Judaism or Christianity. Indeed, marriage, or living in society for life, is not peculiar to man. The fox, marten, wild cat, mole, eagle, sparrow-hawk, pigeon, swan, nightingale, sparrow, swallow, and other creatures, live united in pairs for life. After the breeding season is past, they remain in union; they make their expeditions together, and if they live in herds, the spouses remain always near each other.’ Again, he says—‘In regard to man, I remark that where the three organs of the domestic affections bear a just proportion to each other, and where the moral and intellectual organs are favourably

developed and cultivated, there is not only no desire on either side to bring the marriage tie to an end, but the utmost repugnance to do so. The deep despondency which changes into one unbroken expression of grief and desolation the whole aspect even of the most determined and energetic men, when they lose by death the cherished partners of their lives; and that breaking down of the spirit, profoundly felt, although meekly and resignedly borne, which the widow indicates when her stay and delight is removed from her for ever, proclaim in language too touching and forcible to be misunderstood that, where the marriage union is formed according to Nature's laws, no civil enactments are needed to render it indissoluble during life.' And Mr Barker, in his discussion with Mr Berg said—'There is yet one other form of the family institution, formed by the union of one man and one woman, not blood relations, but one in soul, loving each other with pure and ardent love. There is no authority, no subjection. Neither husband nor wife is master; neither husband nor wife is slave—both *happy* to serve in love; but neither rude nor brutal enough to command. Their children are objects of united love, and sources of delicious enjoyment. The family is a school, where truth and love are taught, and all the forms of virtuous excellence and all the arts of life and blessedness are taught by living and ever-present examples.' This is the picture, says he, '*we* love.' Perhaps the mode in which the civil act of marriage is gone about is not of extreme importance. Our present one is not particularly faulty; but we shall hear Mr Robert Owen:—

‘Persons having an affection for each other, and being desirous of forming a union, first announce such intentions publicly at our Sunday assemblies. If the intention remain at the end of three months, they make a second public declaration, which declaration being registered in the books of the society, will constitute their marriage.’ Much more ceremony and celebration may be gone through by those disposed, but not essential for civil ends. Owen holds ‘celibacy in either sex beyond the period designed by nature to be no virtue; on the contrary, causing crimes and disease, preventing the natural course of both thought and feeling.’ Indeed, human nature is manifestly outraged in celibacy, and in consequence suffers in proportion.

Celibacy not only takes the sunshine of life which by natural right ought to be enjoyed, but it actually encourages licentious thoughts and actions, even as the half-starved are liable to become avaricious, while the well-fed retain gentle civilised manners. External circumstances affect the great majority of us to swell the ranks of the single for a shorter or longer period; and what is the result upon the different constitutions? Nature, in many cases, spurns the artificial restraint of external circumstances, and almost openly professes libertinism; in others, the continuous artificial state lowers the moral sentiments, and illicit liberties are sure to take root; in others there is a continual war, and happily, through much discretion and self-sacrifice, the outward man is yet pure, but the inward man must have suffered. The affectional sentiments are left like

grapes on the vine, to wither and decay; while the other sex are to the same extent left without their natural protector and object of affection, tending to misery and premature death for want of the grapes, which were useless in one sense, and by a legitimate union ought to have formed the perfect human whole, and on both sides diffused purer health and enjoyment. If this is true in a general view in regard to present society, we may expect a material change in the conditions which will influence us in Natural Society. Nothing less than absolute chastity satisfies our moral instincts; so this must become, if it is not already, a matter of public opinion. Besides, this shall be easier when the position of females will give them an independence, and almost certainty of a good husband; and the aggressive spirit in the males, as well as the passive spirit of females, must cease when chastity is given its proper importance and power. And think of the dignity of female virtue, and the males of unsullied honour! Both sexes will have superior education, and more love for the virtues, which must have a good influence.

Marriage, at the proper period of life, is open to all, and artificial power in money and rank are gone for ever. These conditions reversed seem to keep in existence a mighty amount of unchastity at present; so when they cease to exist, we may infer the results will cease also. Unchastity in either sex is a positive vice, must be viewed as such, and which never can be enacted with complacency for public opinion, especially when predisposing causes are removed. Selfishness being no longer

cultivated, but rather repressed, during our early lives, there will be no cross purposes and duplicity. The duty of both is to render each other's happiness complete, as the union seems in nature to have intended to form one from the two.

While it is to be hoped that we will enjoy comparative absolution from the glaring errors now prevalent, absolute perfection in human action is well known to be impossible. Yet duty calls each individual to advance into the pure and perfect character, which our mental eye will sufficiently indicate, as far as possible, and also to guard public morals by public opinion. It would be a grand legitimate glory to any nation to be characterised by all the generous and noble instincts of our nature, and least for those attributes that are base and vicious,

Let us not forget that when marriage succeeds pure love, not too hastily performed, the parties naturally will, and are in duty bound, to take pleasure in serving and rendering each other happy, even were it to self-sacrifice in some degree. The same may be returned, and if not, the giver of the service has the least burden of the two to bear. Between them it is not strict justice that is uppermost, but mutual kindness and regard; and in such cases the tie is happy, and for life, and after this life, were it possible.

Divorce is a door open for the unhappy to return from the mistaken path. They may yet find the true one, and far be it from us to deprive them of an opportunity. Liberty of divorce to the happy is like liberty to thrust one's hand into the burning fire, not requiring a single

thought; and hence the good fortune of those who can look back upon a long matrimonial life of mutual unchanged affection and never-failing love.

VII.—DEATH.

There would have been nothing said on this dread subject were it not for the parrot-cry or opinion that all deaths, human temptations, and trials were by divine authority, and necessary in the present life; and life itself insignificant and unworthy of great attention but for its believed relationship through death. Is it necessary to create and endure human suffering in order to prepare for death? Is it necessary to swallow a creed to have peace on our death-bed? Who hath been calumniated in comparison to the All-pure, Almighty Infinite? Are creeds human, or do they evidence something superior?

We cannot recommend nor condemn; but death must be liberated to come in peace and tranquillity after a long or short life of happiness, brought about in the pure and true institution of Natural Society. If creeds will not admit this, they must thus far be committed in error; for life must be enjoyed to the full. Our every impulse certifies the divine right, and our intellect tells us it is in obedience to the Infinite. Respecting, as we do, all whose opinions are sincerely believed (and every person will have the benefit of being believed sincere till proof is shown to the contrary), it need not be taken amiss nor of importance whatever opinions are those of our convictions in regard to speculative subjects. Not only toleration, but deference, is especially necessary to those who differ

from us; it is a matter of civility; but neither toleration nor deference is proper to the believed erroneous opinions. Only let the expression of speculative opinions be to those only who are agreeable to listen and exchange their sentiments, and the language employed be temperate and civil, for we are all apt to feel offended in hearing our own favourite dogmas torn, rightly or wrongly, to shreds.

It is clearly a duty to investigate and judge for ourselves, even on the subject of death, holding only to that which we conceive to be true. In Archbishop Whately's 'Detached Thoughts' we find these often enforced:—'What is the truth? is a question to which all other questions should be postponed.' 'Men miss truth more often from their indifference about it than from intellectual incapacity.' 'It is a truism, but one often practically forgotten, that there is no medium between truth and falsehood.' Death is a truth, undisputed, and teaching its own pregnant lesson. Then, what is this truth—death? Is it a change of state—of consciousness in being, like the moths and butterflies, or tadpoles into frogs? Or is it a change with no analogy in creation—unnatural and supernatural? Or is it a change from the living organism to the elementary constituents?

We all agree in the fact—death; but what follows death is the rock on which we split, and on which we have no direct evidence except what the corpse presents; and this direct evidence our favourite dogmas ignore. We know how varied have been the beliefs on this sub-

ject by the different nations of the earth, and even the same nations at different times, and how erroneous they must have been if Whately's 'truism' is correct—'no medium between truth and falsehood.' Opinions which are thus found to oppose each other, held by many intelligent persons on both sides, whether the subject be properly speculative or of a common direct nature, ought by both to be held as speculative till a uniformity of opinion prevail. For such differences of opinion to form a foundation of persecution, or even glorification, shows the light quality of the rational faculties; and it is perfect tyranny to the parties acted on, and something approaching insanity when the subject is really speculative.

Expressing opinions is a natural right; but dogmatising and usurping a declamatory and absurd language on what is essentially obscure, to say the least, is pure folly. Every creed takes credit for preparing its professing members for physical death; but nature herself prepares us for that event. It is just as natural as our birth—the one forms the extreme on the one end of the chain, and the other forms the other extremity; beyond either, nothing is visible to the party coming or going. People differ in the love of life, and neither of these extremes is desirable. He who looks on death as a 'distressing event,' as Dr Mason, is surely cowardly. He says further—'It is nature's supreme evil—the abhorrence of God's creation—a monster from whose touch every living thing recoils.' The many suicides hold the other extreme, and although they are commonly said to be insane, it is probably as much from our own state of feeling as from the

evidence of the cases. It is unpleasant to be crossed in love; but suicide is no doubt an extreme cure. Yet some people will not suffer.

Nature uses suffering and debility to prepare us in nature's time for the change; and after a life of much innocent pleasure our knowledge and curiosity become in a state of satiety—our body thoroughly used up—it is, in fact, no great sacrifice. It is not uncommon to hear old people expressing their readiness, sometimes a wish, that time might merge into eternity. Yet life is a glorious blessing, and, when happiness is predominant, it has a powerful hold on all. Nature gives this as an innate instinct, so that death must ever remain excommunicated from the general good-will of humanity. Hence the physician, when our own skill fails, is required to the conservation of the body and the alleviation of suffering; but in a natural state of society neither much suffering nor premature deaths ought to exist, for the normal conditions of things are in favour of health, happiness, and long life.

Yet, since death is a necessity, 'I would like to live as I would like to die,' is as rational and pure a maxim as possible. To live well is to ensure a sweet and consoling remembrance for the future. And when death does come, tears may flow in abundance, especially by those who will remain for a time, and are wrapt in friendship with the dying. Ah! these are nature's products. Who would quarrel with the means, to save more deadly pangs? A death-bed scene of a good, noble, and beloved friend or relation—indeed, any such scene—cannot be trans-

formed into an occasion of rejoicing. Never. Nature revolts at the idea. Talk of a heaven, and rejoice; but the possibility and fear of hell!—can it be excluded as occasion calls? It is said the wish is father to the belief; or, what we wish to believe we do believe. This seems to be the fact with those who have supernatural beliefs, since experience rarely finds an instance in which the horrific gulf is anticipated as the destination of self, or even of beings condemned by the whole community.

One of the most common subjects which disturb the tranquillity which in present circumstances ought uniformly to exist at sick-beds and death-beds is the stern knowledge of leaving a comparatively helpless parent and children to strive and fight the hard battle for life's support. The dying and those left behind are both downcast, and must be resigned; but who can tell the grief endured?—the life possibly sacrificed by the harrassing cares and griefs in the delicate turning-point of the disease. This common occurrence is a fearful account against the individual property principle; the parent and children possibly left in debt. Whether it be the father or mother, the case is one of suffering and which no power common in present society can undertake the alleviation. Who could have heart to answer—the Poor-house? This cannot be listened to with patience. They may take to it; but, in the name of human nature, a more honourable solution is demanded. The bereaved will have our sympathy; but to cast them, or, as the case might be, ourselves into a charity prison-house!

Save us from penning the impulses of an independent spirit! Mankind are brethren—equally creatures of the Infinite. Shall one live in luxuries and superabundance, and leave another to die of heartache, not only without honour, but a public burden, an outcast, with barely the necessities to support life? If this is to exist, where is our justice, honour—not to speak of charity and its kindred virtues? Assuredly they are dead.

Listen not in credulity to the traditional crowings that poverty and all its inherent evil influences are the infliction of Almighty God. God's works are all manifest in the natural creation, but not in the artificial, whether in the individual action or the united action of society. They may be bitter lessons to direct to more true artificial life or action, as indigestion is in following a surfeited stomach. The overfilling of the stomach is attributable to human accountability, not to God; the indigestion is disagreeable, but necessary to teach obedience and truer action, otherwise the destruction of the organism would soon ensue. The very same with poverty. It kills and tortures its thousands; but society will in time learn, and its interest is to learn soon. We create it by adopting individual property, which is purely arbitrary, and has no foundation in nature.

Poverty the work of God! The monstrous untruth! Oh! ye calumniators of the Divine, has your conscience been suffocated, or your rational faculties suppressed? Death is the institution of God; but what is it to the exquisite, life-long misery endured—the revolting crimes of a self-pinioned civilisation?

‘ Mad from life’s history,
Glad to death’s mystery;
Swift to be hurled
Anywhere—anywhere
Out of that world.’

This misery, these trials, and difficulties, are from our own blindness and ignorance; but death is natural and necessary, and, properly considered, it ceases to be dreadful in an evil sense. But let us understand, if possible, the subject on hand, and take an authority or two who may render help as to what death is in reality.

In Liebig’s *Animal Chemistry* we find the following:—‘Death is that condition in which all resistance on the part of the vital force entirely ceases. So long as this condition is not established, the living tissues continue to offer resistance.’ It is the vital powers which sustain the organism; in the different conditions of death the vital powers are suspended. As life is the reverse of death, a negative view of death is had by the positive knowledge of life—of physiology.

Lawrance, in his ‘*Lectures on Anatomy, Physiology, Zoology, and the Natural History of Man,*’ tells us:—‘Life, using the word in its popular and general sense, which at the same time is the only rational and intelligible one, is merely the active state of the animal structure. It includes the notions of sensation, motion, and those ordinary attributes of living beings which are obvious to common observation. It denotes what is apparent to our senses, and cannot be applied to the offspring of metaphysical subtlety, or immaterial abstractions, without a complete departure from its original acceptation—without

obscuring and confusing what is otherwise clear and intelligible.'

Dr A. Combe may be welcome on this subject:—
'During the whole period of life, the body is in a state of constant decay and renovation, and when the due balance between these processes is interfered with, the health immediately suffers, and fatal consequences ensue.' In speaking on death from cold—'Severe cold ceases after a certain time to be painful, and death ensues like deep sleep, and without suffering.' Thus we are so beautifully organised, that our own sensations guide us from death by timely care and counteracting the disturbing causes. If we suffer slightly, we are to take heed and bring back our organism to that 'due balance' which assures us of self-preservation.

We are perfectly aware the subject of death is not uncommonly treated from two opposite points of view—either as life itself, forming the all-essential subject of importance; or, on the other hand, life is viewed as only probationary to an infinitely superior or inferior life to come—succeeding our dissolution. This discussional part must not be entered upon, and is not necessary to the object in hand; enough if we can show that Natural Society will never be rightfully or consistently assailed as incapable of affording all the conditions necessary for life itself, and death too, when it will come. We must take liberty with a homely poet—

'Anither warld I don't dispute—
In space some millions whirl about;
I surely canna miss *ane*;

But first—a step preparatory,
Before I mount another storey,
I'd like my share o' this ane.'

Macqueen's Moorland Minstrel.

But to moderate or assuage a waning, senseless fanaticism, if such is possible—to look more to the purity of their own creed than indulging a censorial propensity in regard to those who differ from them, we will advise one short statement of 'Barker,' which brings the opposing creeds, or rather creed and opinion together, and the statement will probably be admitted by professors of both faiths:—'And the eternal slumber of our race is not a thousandth part so gloomy or so horrible a thought as that of the eternal burning and ever-living tortures of a single soul.'

If such is the truth in regard to the opposing opinions, it will be interesting to witness how this presumptuous one of eternal rewards and punishments will be supported in Natural Society, where there shall be no interested motives possible, from the reigning universal equality of position. But no force nor interference can be permitted on either side so long as individual duty and conduct are compatible with the predominant personal peace and freedom.

The Bible is ostensibly put forth as the foundation of doctrines or opinions of a future life, yet it could be quoted in various places (for instance, Ecc. iii. 19) quite strong and decisive for the reverse opinion; but in this view it is decidedly speculative, and with which we have nothing to do. In the other view of natural death, interest at no

past time could derive a good living out of teaching what was easily understood. It is surely Eliza Cook who said death was like the sun, on which man cannot keep his eye; nor is there any necessity or good to be derived—in the one case the physical or cognisant eyes would be put in a deranged state, and, in the other, by an endeavour to realise the most gloomy and miserable phases of which our lives might be made subject, the physical but hidden mental eye might be likewise deranged. And it is nature that prompts us to the bright phases of life, even as the lighter substances uniformly tend to and find the higher elevation; and both duty and interest justify and support the necessity and beauty of living a life of the most elevated and pure happiness.

When the whole life is as pure as possible, and at least our motives and conduct under a strict judgment for good, then in life's ebbing tide, when full of reminiscences, we may be assured of serenity and peace; approaching death shall be neither sought nor feared. Present society sadly interferes with this; but let us rejoice, if not in our day, in future generations not far off, when life shall be an unqualified blessing, and, in regard to its continuation, everlasting, this will be universal, and without great effort or great sacrifice.

END OF PART SECOND.



PART THIRD.

THE CHANGE.

M. LOUIS BLANC quotes Lamartine in his 'Organisation of Labour':—' So long as this immense problem shall not be solved in the interest of all, there never will be repose for society nor security for the rich man. He is as much interested as the operative that its solution be prompt and, above all, equitable.' This is certain, and were the rich generally to realise its truth, we would be preserved from doubting the life-hold property takes of the rich. But it is unquestionable, in whatever rank of society, when the community commonwealth is properly understood, its merits are appreciated. It carries within itself a charm of truth, an assurance of general good conduct, a certainty of abundance to all, and that with only moderate labour, and of course with some comparatively small amount of human error.

The race has always had an eye to it; hence the ancient Lycurgus, Socrates, Plato, and the vast number who have recorded similar opinions, are held in high repute. Christianity has always been in some degree associated with it. The Essenes attempted it practically, and Jesus was of that sect. Necessaries were made common in his social life, which was illustrative and presumptive proof of his appreciation. Such principle and

practice have been and ever will be esteemed by sincere wellwishers for the great human family. But the difficulty—the insurmountable barrier—has not been less sensibly felt, and as yet has been too much for us. What is this that is impassable? It is the change fundamentally from one constitution of society to another—from individual poverty to a pure commonwealth. It, no doubt, will form the greatest crisis in the history of the human family; and in proportion to its importance and magnitude have been the obstacles to be overcome. The greatest is, without doubt, our own ignorance, our general want of the pure truth. But the subject has been a special one for gross misrepresentation, so that our ignorance is accounted for in some degree. Community has been taxed with every evil of an aggravated kind, calumniated to the last degree, and even pronounced dead. Credulous mortals have thus been led to sleep on in their present inevitable state of irrationality, degradation, and corruption. Exceptions have always been, but only exceptions. Nay, more, the present existing system, subversive of all our nobler instincts and natural acquirements, is held out and swallowed as emanating from the source of all that is pure, good, and beneficent—all that is wonderful in wisdom, power, and sublimity. The question in its own merits is sunk, and all the present practice in society outrageously attributed to the Infinite All Good. Hence the great truths of modern discovery have only supported and developed the great human errors, from man's blindness to distinguish them. The divine authority has been made to bear the

burden of human tyranny, passion, and mistaken interest, resulting from error in principles and institutions. God is the author of all things, but not accountable for human beliefs and actions. If our wives and daughters will use crinoline, the deaths from fire must not be held to be express from divine authority. Extreme poverty and riches the same. This deludes our senses, by giving erroneous opinions; and there is active opposition from vested interests.

Opposition to almost everything new has been uniform, no matter how important and simple. It seems to be part of our false education in individual interests; for whether in the rich or poor, if the change is not favourable to them, either error, prejudice, or interest has set them in opposition according to the power at their disposal and the quality of the leaders. 'Turnpike roads,' says the Rev. Sydney Smith, 'navigable canals, inoculation, hops, tobacco, the Reformation, the Revolution—there are always a set of worthy and moderately-gifted men who bawl out death and ruin upon every valuable change which the very aspect of human affairs absolutely and imperiously requires. I have often thought that it would be extremely useful to make a collection of the hatred and abuse that all those changes have experienced which are now admitted to be marked improvements in our condition. Such a history might make folly a little more modest and suspicious of its own decisions.'

The days for such folly in Britain are nearly at a close in regard to useful improvements and inventions; but those matters which dispense equally to all political and

social rights are not of the same category. Yet these improvements which have found a footing among us, although not of a directly operative kind to social and political conditions, they are in the right direction, and really enable us to acquire more knowledge and advantages ; indeed, they are the edge of the wedge which has firmly entered, and it remains only a matter of time when the grand consummation will occur. The social rights being the ultimate, it assumes the position of greatest importance ; but party opposition is weakening everywhere into what might be called rationality, and opposition in this respect cannot be avoided nor undesirable until the balance of opinions have found majority. But why should we expect a radical and extraordinary change, when contests are long and hard for almost insignificant beneficial changes in present society ? Because they are somewhat insignificant, and justice only troubles to agitate and advocate for them ; on the other hand, interested parties are to be combated and overthrown. Because changes generally demanded are not at first clearly just, therefore subject to suspicion and opposition ; and because radical changes, involving principles, are evidently the interest of all people, and the broader the agitation the greater majority and stronger a union may arise into existence. One clear object in view, and there need be no fear of the triumph.

No personal power can now stem that tide of humanity which has set onwards. It has found a footing in every station of life, and must go on to accomplish its purpose

in accordance to the eternal over-ruling laws, till true knowledge and practice consistent is universally desired—then the spell that has hung on so many generations will fall for ever, and its palpable flimsiness and absurdity will seem to want proportion to the pernicious power it so long held. Our principles must have the seal of the divine, so each should draw from the fountain of all truth—creation; and hence the power of the inevitable will be manifest; and embued with the prestige of universal beneficence, with its elevating duties and tolerant spirit, the work of nature will speedily be accomplished. Self-sovereignty is our birthright; and divine truth, which is absolute and open to all, insures unity. Natural and genuine life is altogether opposed to that spurious hypocritical acting so common at present; the wealthy as well as the poor will find a state of life equally superior to what has been experienced.

Mr Howard paid Joseph II., Emperor of Austria, a visit in 1786. 'The Emperor afterwards told his Minister that he was greatly pleased with Mr Howard's visit—that he was a man without ceremony or compliment, and that he liked him the better for it.' Our beloved Queen has shown and enjoyed much of this pure and natural life. The incognita of rank is a common source, although not the best source by which to derive happiness. Oppression of external circumstances may sap the happiness of the poor, yet the mental organs will not believe in this miserable destiny.

The author of the 'Moorland Minstrel' is a specimen of this class who seek to rise, while the wealthy class

inclines to the wholesome conditions of the many. He says :—

‘ Still sweet hopes, with heav’nly feeling,
 Point to something far away—
 Soaring proudly, and unsealing
 Glories of a future day.
 Soothing hopes—celestial beauty,
 Still to guiltless spirits given—
 Cheering grief, and sweet’ning duty—
 Thou art virtue’s certain heaven.’

Why should one class live in an artificial and spurious atmosphere, on their thousands a year, and another toil and vegetate on hardly the necessaries for sustenance? They both have hopes of happiness—feelings that experience is quite insufficient; but an example to the contrary, of the realisation of happiness, is rarely, if ever, to be encountered. Ennui is dominant here—exhaustion is the rule there; gout (indicative of too much nourishment for the physical exertion endured) is characteristic here—rheumatism (indicative of the food being less than necessary for the material waste) is the common condition there. Is it possible a miserable barbaric pride is to detain any class from falling into that state of society which is necessary for all to secure a natural, happy, and virtuous life? Whatever be the answer, we proceed upon the idea that people are rational enough to know their own interest, to desire a more pure life for themselves and others, and the inexpressable happiness of seeing and being in a state of universal comfort, peace, and goodwill.

Is the change to be effected by Government? or is it

to be initiated and developed by ourselves? We will look at the first of these two questions. There is no need to enter on a long exposition as to how kings, emperors, princes, party leaders, and usurpers of power, intrigue and make public promises for their own purposes, to be evaded or repudiated according to the dispositions and expediences predominant—how power corrupts, and courtiers are led to deceive intentionally by flattery and absurd delicacy for fear they offend—thus adding fuel to the fire of tyranny. Do not be surprised at the despotisms of the earth; they are a natural growth in the artificial circumstances, and it would be a difficult, if not impossible, task to distribute anything like just censure to those who lent themselves in its development. But one thing is sure—one judgment is necessary, one destiny is before them all; they must give place to the natural laws in as far as they at present occupy their place.

We must be guided by divine truth, and not by human enactments: our individual sovereignty must no longer be a sham. In nature, it is a reality; but in a poor needle-woman, a negro, or a rich miser, what is it? But there is a greater power—a more despotic despotism than merely tyrannies or governments to crush—there is the common practical principle of individual property. State officials somehow represent this power, but they are innocent of its evil influence. They may have virtues or vices of their own, but this is a monster which deprives human life of its normal happiness; it ensures misery, deep and universal, and has defied the true action of humanity for its destruction for many generations,

We of this generation stand on a superior position for this mighty work, and, with the divine help of truth, the enemy shall be overcome, and the combat shall be full of glory and free of bloodshed. Could this work be left to Governments? Could they be safely trusted to suppress it, when they are generally composed of men of property interests? Would you recommend the slaves to delegate their individual sovereignty (for they also have by nature their sovereign rights, although robbed continuously of them) to a few slaveholders to investigate the domestic institution, and find if means were possible for its improvement, amelioration, or even annihilation? Never. Even so we say; never shall the best regulated government or parliament find us delegating our individual sovereignty to decide whether we shall have *divine* or *human* laws and institutions. Experience warns us—reason teaches us—to avoid unnecessary delegation of power; and duty requires us to perform for ourselves all duties that devolve on us in as far as possible.

We are not in a state of society to encourage delegation of power; the temptations to abuse of power are already too strong and common. Listen to Mr Robert Cooper, in a monthly periodical (the Investigator):—‘No delusion could be more fatal than supposing that despotism, political or religious, will concede one inch, except by force, moral or physical. The spirit of domination will never voluntarily relinquish her throne. History teaches the great lesson that no epoch in progress has been developed and consummated by expediency. The Reformation was not the work of ex-

pediency. The English Revolution was not the result of expediency. American independence was not the reward of expediency. A free Press—and a cheap Press—in Great Britain was not achieved by expediency.'

We may then rest assured, and saved from disappointment, if the grand work of immolating the individual property principle and practice be not left or put into the hands of any delegated representatives to say when it shall be expedient. This brings us to the other alternative of doing what we have to perform ourselves. It will not be doubted that the work will be better and more sure if we take an active hand and interest in it individually; and, to carry it on successfully, there ought to be some statement involving one uniform sentiment or desire of change from the present constitution of society on property to that of community of interests.

As no individual influence can greatly affect this change—for nothing less than the natural truth, and every person may be susceptible of its influence, and no one can assume to be its special oracle—the utmost liberty of opinion must be permitted. Erroneous opinions are not to be quashed, but shown to be erroneous. This is not only more becoming rational beings, but helps to develop the truth. It is but a sickly and delicate plant which cannot stand winds from all quarters of the compass:—

'Truth, crush'd to earth, shall rise again—
The eternal years of God's are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers.'

The Total Abstinence Society is a good illustration of

how many persons of different opinions may be held together by the simple statement for a given object ; and the Chartist Society of its utter want or at least loose fulfilment. Gammage, in his 'History of the Chartist Movement' says—'Reason was trampled under foot ; passion, led by the spirit of demagogism, was rampant ; and no man stood the slightest chance who had courage enough to diverge from the path marked out by O'Connor and the Northern Star.' 'Until the spread of knowledge is at least general amongst the people, it is vain to expect that they will ever enter into any organisation sufficient for the accomplishment of their rights. In the spreading of that knowledge it matters not whether there are one or a hundred associations, so that all have the one great object in view. The mischief which has been attributed to a diversity of opinion and action on points of policy did not arise from that source, but from the fact that one section of the Chartist body could not tolerate a different policy to its own. Hence the strife and bickering ; hence the dwindling down of the Chartist body from powerful bodies to comparatively insignificant units.'

No doubt we shall be guided by past experience ; it is a national characteristic very commendable. But before going farther, as we have said one object universally in view was of first importance, it might be as well to present an affirmation which all persons disposed might subscribe, not that it must be used for that purpose, but only to illustrate what might be required.

'I do most sincerely and firmly desire, by all peaceable and proper means, to have the present constitution of

society on individual property superseded by one ensuring the common necessary duties and common necessary comforts of life ; at the same time, I promise to do my share of the necessary duties of the society or community in which I will be a member to the best of my abilities, and for the public interest.'

A better one, of course, is desirable, and will be had when it shall become necessary ; yet that one is sufficient for the present purpose, so we shall now inquire how a society should act which has the great majority of a nation enrolled as members, to effect the change. Two modes present themselves—insurrection, and moral power. Really intelligent and sagacious men or authorities for insurrection there are none. It might suit for usurpation of power in present society, as we have many in history, but for our purpose it is worse than useless.

Hume, in his *History of England*, tells us :—'It is seldom that the people gain anything by revolutions in government, because the new settlement, jealous and insecure, must commonly be supported with more expense and severity than the old.' And on the Parliamentary rule, in opposition to King Charles :—'Never, in this island, was known a more severe and arbitrary government than was generally exercised by the patrons of liberty in both kingdoms.'

Godwin, in his '*Political Justice*,' gives safe guidance :—'He that desires a revolution for its own sake is to be regarded as a madman. He that desires it from a thorough conviction of its usefulness and necessity has a claim upon us for candour and respect.' 'But let us

suppose that the prospect of success is considerable, and that there is reason to believe that resolute violence may in no long time accomplish its purpose. Even here we may be allowed to hesitate. Force has already appeared to be an odious weapon; and if the use of it be to be regretted in the hands of Government, it does not change its nature though wielded by a band of patriots. If the cause we plead be the cause of truth, there is no doubt that, by our reasonings, if sufficiently zealous and constant, the same purpose may be effected in a milder and more liberal way. In a word, it is proper to recollect here what has been established as to the doctrine of force in general, that it is in no case to be employed but where every other means is ineffectual.'

We take to moral power with pleasure, as the instrument most suiting our human nature, and the age in which we live. It is of noble origin, and consistent with the rationality of our being. It implies a consciousness of our cause being the cause of truth; and if there be opposition, and they have the same reliance in moral power, there is nothing necessarily in the encounter to alienate mutual good-will. This course involves self-sovereignty—not opinions at second hand, nor hearsay evidence in matters which our own senses can investigate; and as no one is superior in kind of abilities, being all of the same, only differing in degrees of power, no one can assume dogmatic theorems without detracting from his own character.

'Emancipation from error,' says Robert Cooper, 'oppression, crime, and misery, must be a *self*-emancipation.

This is becoming a household conviction amongst the intelligent and thinking masses of Europe and America. Crowned heads and mitred surplices stand aghast at the changes rolling around them; but the cry is heard reverberating from shore to shore—the only “safe” reliance is *self-reliance*, the only true “salvation” is *self-salvation*.’ Nature hath placed this salvation naturally within the possible in all time, past, present, and future. We have as yet never been her intelligent and obedient creatures. We cannot be going on working twelve hours each day, in circumstances degrading to human dignity, and at the same time expect ‘Thy will be done on earth!’ We cannot allow the desire of property to corrode the superior faculties, and stimulate the inferior, and in the same breath say, ‘Give us this day our daily bread!’

We must trust Nature, which includes trust in each other, and not make an artificial power which few can wield successfully, and none happily, and the great majority miserably, yet expecting ‘the good time coming.’ We ought to use the means, and nature will give the blessing; but we acquiesce in individual property, the selfish distinction of master and servant. Society is not only full of error, but also corruption; yet we would have our sons trained in honour and intelligence, our daughters the same, and both in purity and virtue! We will cultivate thorns, and would we expect grapes? The comparative perfectability of human character is quite a common conviction, and no doubt our common nature is the ground on which these bright hopes are founded; but how few do come near the ideal? Where they exist

society has done its worst in the circumstances, and beat off successfully by the innate desires for excelsior.

Mrs Shelley, in a note to her husband's poetry, observes:—' Shelley believed that mankind had only to will that there should be no evil, and there would be none. It is not my part in these notes to notice the arguments that have been urged against this opinion, but to mention the fact that he entertained, and was indeed attached to it with fervent enthusiasm.' To whom the leadership of society will fall is of less importance to us at present than to know and believe with some degree of confidence that they must be those of comparatively superior natural abilities and industrial acquirements. They will naturally be the choice from every department of industry, and that choice will probably fall on those known to be able and energetic enough to occupy a position of some responsibility. To them the duty is easy and natural, the right men in their right places. This is not only a source of pleasure for them, but a desideratum for the people who have the benefit of their services.

Nature evidently destined the intellect and superior sentiments to shape and direct our individual character; and surely those most certainly gifted with those natural faculties will be chosen and well adapted for positions of management, with the higher class of public duties attached. They are public servants, not lawgivers; honoured officials, not dictators. Thus we have the very best guarantee that Natural Society will ensure its members to be peaceful and rational, virtuous, and intelligent. The change will be brought about by absolute truth,

which effects unity of opinion. A little genuine leaven shall in time leaven the whole. Isolated interests are already seen to be destructive, and united interests to be of wonderful power for good or evil; and good now is becoming the predominant wish.

Without Nature's truth becoming almost universal, we cannot move for general benefit; we must wait and endeavour to assist Nature in the teaching of her social truths. 'What sort of opinion is that,' says Godwin, 'which thus stands in need of some sudden violence to oblige it to start from its hiding-place? The sentiments of mankind are then only equivocal in external appearance when they are unformed and uncertain in the conception. When once the individual knows his own meaning, its symptoms will be clear and unequivocal. Be not precipitate. If the embryo sentiment at present existing in my mind be true, there is hope that it will gain strength by time. If you wish to assist its growth, let it be by instruction—not by attempting to pass that sentiment for mine which you only wish to be so. If the opinion of the people be not known to-day, it will not fail to show itself to-morrow. If the opinion of the people be not known to-day, it is because that which you would have supposed to be their opinion is not sufficiently their opinion. You might as well think of hiding the inhabitants of England, concealing their towns and cultivation, and making their country pass for a desert, as of concealing their real and deliberate sentiment.' 'When the true crisis shall come, not a sword will need to be drawn, not a finger to be lifted up. The adversaries

will be too few and too feeble to dare to make a stand against the universal sense of mankind.' 'Let us admit into our bosoms neither contempt, animosity, resentment, nor revenge. The cause of justice is the cause of humanity. Its advocates should overflow with universal good-will. We should love this cause, for it conduces to the general happiness of mankind. We should love it, for there is not a man that lives, who, in the natural and tranquil progress of things, will not be made happier by its approach.'

Thus we rely entirely on the intrinsic truth of Natural Society. Besides having a society formed to receive adherents to the community or social principle, we would have others, numerous as the industrial departments may be conceived to be requisite. Each branch of industry or trade would thus be specially formed into a society of itself, on purpose to supply the whole society or community, and exportation to other communities where the kind of business required this, so that the organisation of the co-operative principle would be as entire as possible to begin the work on the new (to us) basis.

They would be localised in towns and country, and each one in every respect independent; but the heads would be expected to have an understanding with the heads of other branches. Rules and regulations do not relish much, yet, leaving this to themselves, every such industrial organisation, as well as the *Catholic Society*, in subscribing the declaration, shall be entitled to vote by ballot for the expulsion of any disreputable person or spy—the majority in every case deciding the question.

Females, of course, forming in some cases entire branches, as in female attire making, house cleaning, &c. ; and in others they would join membership with the males in those employments where both sexes are engaged together; for, as we have stated, the time occupied in necessary labour will be the same for both sexes, and the leisure time equally at their disposal. The males, of course, will find occasional occupation in their leisure hours to the service of the females, and the reverse by the females to the males, in the way of acts of kindness and mutual obligations; for although we have the necessaries of life common, there is much required that involves labour taken up at our own hands, and must be voluntarily bestowed, both in works belonging to the useful and ornamental. There is no force applied, so, if a gent wanted something involving much labour, and of a nature not to be expected common in society, he must want it, or set about the work himself, and by good-will, perhaps, find much assistance.

Perhaps the reins have been loose for a moment, but we will show one difficulty ahead which it was impossible to have passed without notice. This is paying off the National Debt, the purchase of the lands, houses, ships, and machinery of all those owners demanding payment for them. The majority will no doubt simply acquiesce to the common membership of Natural Society, but with the others there is to be no wholesale national robbery perpetrated—no deprivation of any class of accustomed affluence. It would ill become those who hope to raise their conditions in life to render any class in society worse.

Nor is it necessary, although it may involve difficulties which we cannot at present overcome.

Justice demands our care for the happiness of every class alike ; and, to act for this result, the circumstances in which every person has been accustomed to live must be kept in view. Six hours of necessary labour is what we propose beginning with. This is only the first instalment of the advantages ultimately to be derived by the daily-toiling slaves ; but those who never have known labour as such must not be expected—although it might be accepted when offered voluntarily—to commence now if in full maturity of years. Youth can, and probably will, most willingly engage in labour on such moderate terms ; but voluntary workers only are worthy our attention—no severe sifting of motives. The proper organisation and knowledge of demand and supply, with the necessary labour involved in the new circumstances, will be better accomplished with hearty volunteers.

The moment absolute community is established, every day and every month will bring its accessions to the common duties and enjoyments, which, in the physical sense, is the consummation of constitutional perfection possible for man in society. So those unable or unwilling to engage in the necessary labour of society immediately succeeding the change may be left to themselves, and duly supplied with all the necessaries of life, the same as those who do perform their duties ; of course their odious position shall be known. It can only be the senseless and intellectually powerless among those accustomed to labour who would demur to fully supplying the wants of all,

and more especially so if the non-producers are principally those who have been bred in affluence. Then the Justices and Managers must be prepared to supply necessities to all families at present in affluent circumstances. This understanding should be mutual and unequivocal. These families, retaining their house or houses, and their accustomed amount of pleasure-grounds, they will probably be agreeable that the remainder, if such exist, of lands, houses, &c., be unreservedly occupied for public purposes. Fund-holders, railway stock, &c., &c. holders may be agreed with equally the same; and the Justices shall take up the cases in their districts and make inquiries and arrangements with each party.

It would be proper for each community to be in possession of some book recording the value of property taken possession of in money, whatever be the marketable value at the time. And also each person's accounts squared and put to his credit or debt—personal property not being included. Fears for cases of determined idleness will be difficult to allay, but they are, nevertheless, groundless in any significant degree. For do not doubt labour—yes, physical labour—has its charms and attraction, and will continuously add to the industrial hive, even from that class where the artificial right of exemption might have been claimed. It is a barbaric pride, along with the slavish amount of labour and low remuneration, which has long given a most honourable, divinely instituted occupation a fashionable disrepute.

The drunkard does not love the severely abstemious, nor the drone the working bee, nor the dishonest the

punctiliously honest. This is on the one side corruption and barbaric pride, not to use harsher terms, which estrange them. The reverse is by no means the rule—that is, ill-feeling in the honest, &c. ; nor is there any occasion—they are saved by a purer and more intelligent light. There is nothing in nature to justify a man from discontinuing necessary labour, if his health and strength continue good, even were he to become the greatest inventor or the most artistic artist alive. Neither is it his interest to avoid the necessary duties of common life. They are very questionable geniuses who would require their whole time to be occupied in their studies or studios (excepting for a living in present society), and it would be charitable to give them necessary duties, by way of change. But we would not dare to say one-half as much in reference to the common labour of present society. No reference is here to ten or twelve hours' necessary labour. If we say six hours daily to begin with, in a twelvemonth's time it might be reduced to one-third.

If a large majority of the wealthy class would accede to the arrangements above alluded to, before the actual change, it would ensure a better feeling and more kindness, for such cannot be commanded by law or authority. We will hope the best, and wait. But those of that class who would sooner see the island sunk in the waters which surround it than make agreements or compromise with the 'slavish herd,' if such exist, they may be left in possession of their property ; perhaps there may be room enough without it, while they breathe the infernal breath. While they have an option to refuse exchange for the

almost unnecessary circulating medium, gold, we have the same in refusing the gold in exchange. We will leave the parties interested to settle, or perhaps death may be waited on: a little patience, and all accounts will be settled inevitably. It is desirable that an equal burden should fall upon the whole nation of workers for the support of the 'privileged class.' For this purpose, numbers form the one article in the account, and each community in proportion shall contribute to the supply, in whatever part of the nation. The supplies furnished shall be properly kept account of for that purpose, in hours of labour; nor is there occasion for them to confine themselves to one part of the kingdom, when all parts shall have embraced the community principle. Or if any part had not embraced this principle, they might be supplied with sterling gold to travel there, were they desirous, also for the Continent of Europe, and limited, perhaps, to one year at a time, if their health did not absolutely require a longer stay. On the principle of free trade it ought to weigh light with us whether they are at home or abroad. We beg to differ preferring home, for the certainty of the balance coming back in foreign trade is questionable.

We must produce the necessary funds for these purposes when they are duly given notice of and required. Living on the Continent, or abroad occasionally, is quite a necessity for that class, and no doubt it may be greatly conducive to health at particular seasons. The Justices in town holding the treasure will, upon proper application, allow what is required. No other purpose can coin

be adapted for ; and when the whole of Europe and the nations of the earth are wise enough to associate equally on the same principle, the balances can be struck in 'labour accounts' the same as between communities at home ; the gold will then be unnecessary throughout the whole race. Perhaps there might be some use, and few objections, to the privileged class forming a Council of State for the Queen, nominated by herself ; they might entertain and communicate with the same class in other nations—but all really responsible offices to be filled by common citizens, in the usual mode of progressive election.

So long as the privileged class are characterised by good and rational conduct, they will be special subjects of interest ; without good conduct they must not expect honour for mere rank or position. Other positions might be accepted by some of that class, and it would accord with both society's and their interest and happiness to find and occupy them. But the idea of that class maintaining intact the privileges enjoyed, for generations to come—for these privileges to be hereditary in their families, is not only impossible in the families themselves, but it could not occur in society, for the greater attraction and pleasure in life will now be with the working orders. People cannot be forced to pay deference to them, nor is it desirable—hence their life may have all the luxuries and reservedness it has at present ; but the ideas of people are changed—work is now honourable. So these privileges are not in nature, and must succumb—but with no violence ; neither the desire on the one hand, nor the fear on the other, of their being permanent, is well grounded.

Our reigning dynasty may be sedulously cherished and encouraged—as it well deserves—for a long time after the change ; but, losing its intelligence or character, it too would fall into the common race. That we are not alone in believing the privileged class capable of accommodating themselves to the inevitable changes which some time must come, we will refer to an idea or two of Sydney Smith's :—‘ As mankind becomes more enlightened the diffusion of power becomes inevitable. When nations are capable of becoming a law unto themselves they cease to suffer others to become a law unto them.’ ‘ It is not the spirit of innovation, but the essential requirements of society, which necessitate a change.’ ‘ We do not think so meanly of our nobility as to believe that they would not even sacrifice their own order to save their country. We will not judge so uncharitably of the masses as to suppose them insensible to sympathy and kindness.’ And George Combe we find on another phase of the same subject :—‘ Those who feel alarm at the march of democracy read history without the lights of philosophy. They have their minds filled with the barbarous democracies of Greece and Rome, and of the French Revolution, and tremble at the anticipated rule of an ignorant rabble in Britain. On the other hand, the only democracy which I anticipate to be capable of gaining the ascendancy here will be that of civilised and enlightened, of moral and refined men ; and if the principles which I have expounded be correct, that the higher sentiments and intellect are intended by nature to govern, it will be morally impossible that while an enlightened and an

ignorant class co-exist, as in Britain, the ignorant can rule.'

The Rev. Dr V. Knox holds :—' Every individual, in a free country, has a right to approve or disapprove the system under which he lives, without peril or control, while he preserves the peace. His peaceable deportment and acquiescence in the opinion of others, contrary to his own conviction, render him a very meritorious character. He may be won over by gentleness; but force only tends to excite the violence which it would imperiously repel.' 'Wisdom is gentle, deliberate, cautious. Nothing violent is durable; I hope the lovers of liberty will show the sincerity of their attachment by the wisdom of their conduct.' 'Let the reformation be gentle, though firm; wise, though bold; lenient to persons erring, though severe against error. Let her not alarm the friends of LIBERTY by sudden violence, but invite all to the cause of truth and justice, by showing that she is herself guarded, not only by truth and justice, but by MERCY. Let us show ourselves, in seeking political reformation, what we profess to be—a nation of Christians, if not philosophers—and let not a groan be heard amid the acclamations of triumphant liberty, nor one drop of blood sadden the glorious victory of philosophy and Christianity over PRIDE.'

If we hold the truth, the change must be for the better. We have given the convictions which have stood the test of years in too few and inelegant words to command approval, it is to be feared; but, along with the authorities of standing, and guidance in individual experience,

there is room for counsel and thought over those parts which are apparently dark or otherwise unsatisfactory. One thing is sure: what has been put forth has been from an impulse of duty and an approving conscience. As a whole, there may be something of innovation; but every part has a far wider support, from the best authorities, than merely our own, and some of these we have thought fit to introduce.

One of the principal parts, because it gives assurance of rights and responsibilities in man, and in which he may choose and practice contentment and joy, has the authority of Bishop Butler in these few words:—‘Now, in the present state, all which we enjoy, and a great part of what we suffer, is PUT IN OUR OWN POWER; for pleasure and pain are the consequences of our actions, and we are endowed by the Author of our nature with capacities of foreseeing these consequences.’ We desire pleasure, but pain is made to exist by the evil influences of the constitution of society; without these the people would be moral for the reason that pain was undesirable—for virtue and happiness are twins in nature.

There is F. de Lamennais, in ‘The Book of the People,’ tells us—‘If ye would succeed, do what is good by good means. Confound not strength, directed by justice and charity, with brutal and ferocious violence. If ye would succeed, think of your brethren as well as yourselves. Let their cause be your cause, their good be your good, their evil be your evil. See yourselves and feel yourselves only in them. Let your indifference be transformed into deep sympathy, and your selfishness into self-devotion.’

‘Isolated, at present, because every man is occupied solely with himself—with his personal ends, ye are opposed to each other, ye are subjugated by the instrumentality of each other. When ye shall have only one interest, one will, one common action, where is the force that will subdue you?’ ‘Your task is great, and it is this—ye have to form the universal family—to construct the city of God—to accomplish progressively, by uninterrupted labour, His work in humanity.’

THE END



